

published monthly since 1866

Fortnightly

FOUNDED IN 1865 BY ANTHONY TROLLOPE

JUNE, 1952

MXCVI N.S.

CONTENTS

Illinois U Library

CHURCHILL'S GOVERNMENT

A. MALAN

QUADOR

LABOUR PARTY POLICY IN TRANSITION

AUSTRALIAN IMMIGRATION

WHAT WORKERS' EDUCATION NEEDS

REVIEWS AND REVIEWERS

THE THUNDERER'S AUTOBIOGRAPHY

THE WATER—A Poem

OUR CENTURIES OF EDWARD VI SCHOOLS

THE IDEAL OF FRATERNITÉ (1789-1849)—II

Correspondence—THE FOURTH YEAR OF ISRAEL

SETTLING IN NEW ZEALAND A CENTURY AGO

L. E. NEAME

N. P. MACDONALD

GILBERT McALLISTER

JOHN MOSS

G. D. H. COLE

MAX BELOFF

H. G. NICHOLAS

GLORIA KOMAI

RUPERT MARTIN

DAVID THOMSON

The Fortnightly Library :

THE DAMNABLE PACT

NORMAN NICHOLSON

Other Contributors : W. Horsfall Carter, David Thomson, W. T. Wells, M.P.,
H. C. Dent, S. L. Bensusan, Grace Banyard.

3s. 6d. or

55 CENTS

USA 60 CENTS

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

42s. PER ANNUM or

U.S.A. \$6.50

CANADA \$7.00

ALL CLASSES
OF INSURANCE
TRANSACTIONED

CAR & GENERAL
INSURANCE CORPORATION LIMITED
83, PALL MALL, LONDON, S.W.1

CONTENTS—continued.

REVIEWS AND REVIEWERS. BY MAX BELOFF	399
THE THUNDERER'S AUTOBIOGRAPHY. BY H. G. NICHOLAS	404
IN THE WATER— <i>A Poem</i> . BY GLORIA KOMAI	409
FOUR CENTURIES OF EDWARD VI SCHOOLS. BY RUPERT MARTIN	410
THE IDEAL OF <i>Fraternité</i> (1789-1849)—II. BY DAVID THOMSON	415
Correspondence—THE FOURTH YEAR OF ISRAEL. NORMAN BENTWICH	422
SETTLING IN NEW ZEALAND A CENTURY AGO	423

THE FORTNIGHTLY LIBRARY:

THE DAMNABLE PACT. BY NORMAN NICHOLSON	324
--	-----

Other Contributors: *W. Horsfall Carter, David Thomson, W. T. Wells, M.P., H. C. Dent, S. L. Bensusan, Grace Banyard.*

- ¶ Published Monthly by THE FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW, LTD., at 4, 5 & 6, Soho Square, London, W.1.
- ¶ While the Editor is glad to consider articles offered for publication, he cannot undertake to return MSS. unless accompanied by a stamped envelope.
- ¶ Entered as second-class matter, January 4, 1934, at the Post Office at New York, N.Y., under the Act of March 3, 1897 (Sec. 397 P.L. & R.).
- ¶ Registered for transmission by Canadian Magazine Post.

"WHOSOEVER will, let him take the **WATER of LIFE** freely". (*Rev. xccii., 17*)

WATER AND THE SPIRIT

THE
NEW SACRAMENT
FOR THE
NEW DISPENSATION

For
HEALING and DELIVERANCE
in the **TRIBULATIONS** now in
evidence preceding
THE COMING of THE LORD

Write to
THE PANACEA SOCIETY,
Bedford, England
THERE IS NOTHING TO PAY

WHERE TO STAY

WELLINGTON HOTEL

TUNBRIDGE WELLS.

Delightfully situated at the summit of the Common facing South. Private suites at moderate terms. Lock-up Garage. Passenger Lift. First-class management.

Hot and cold water and gas fires in bedrooms.

UNSURPASSED FOR SITUATION AND SERVICE

Telephone: 1150

Proprietors: Trust Houses Ltd.

MISS CONNIE WINN

reopens **UPLANDS, ALDEBURGH**, Suffolk as Hotel from April. **ARTISTS** specially welcomed during **MAY** when life models, criticism from well known artists provided.

Tel. Renown **4154 LONDON**
or write **Aldeburgh**

LLANGOLLEN. Hand Hotel. One of the best in N. Wales. H. & C. water all rooms. Facing River Dee, free fishing (trout). A.A. & R.A.C. Tel. 3207.

THE FORTNIGHTLY

JUNE, 1952

MR. CHURCHILL'S GOVERNMENT

MR. CHURCHILL'S reputation as the greatest living Englishman has never been in doubt since 1940; his reputation as an administrator and a policy maker has violently oscillated throughout the whole of his life. As the wartime Coalition showed, he can invoke admiration in a variety of rôles. His repertoire ranges from the desperate cavalier through the urbane political tactician to the elder statesman and the *enfant terrible*. It was in the last rôle that he lost the election of 1945, and his reported comment that Lord Baldwin could have pulled it off revealed a deep insight into the character of the electorate. It was in a combination of the parts of patriot king and experienced public servant that he won the election of 1951. In the last few weeks, he has shown a tendency to revert to the immediate post-war phase with the difference, which has done nothing to increase his stock in public confidence that he is now the head of a Government, not the leader of an Opposition remote from the prospect of office.

Although the exact significance of the local elections cannot be known, they reveal a noticeable swing of the pendulum. It was local elections which heralded the revolt against the Socialists, and now that they are fought on party lines it is impossible to disregard the evidence they offer as it could have been disregarded before the war. Mr. Churchill's Government are losing ground in the country, and it is depressing for a Government to know that nothing but the statutory duration of a Parliament stands between them and extinction.

All the evidence suggests, however, that Mr. Churchill and his colleagues were punished at the local elections for their handling of affairs as well as for their policies. They have done things which were bound to alienate those of their supporters who hoped, often on the strength of dishonest electoral professions, that the election of a Tory Government would mean a sudden translation to the conditions of 1938, and the outbreak of unemployment in Lancashire has helped to confirm the fears of those who believed that it would mean a return to 1931. For the middle classes, the Conservative victory has meant, as a result of Mr. Butler's manipulation of the Bank Rate, the unaccustomed necessity to live within their incomes. The cost of living on which the election was won has not gone down perceptibly, and only a panic-stricken concession to public opinion has stopped it from increasing in one particularly noticeable

respect, transport fares. It is little wonder that the Government are losing ground.

It is equally clear that this is the kind of ground which they should have expected to lose. The Government came to power on the strength of a promise to administer efficiently without class bias or sectarian prejudice. The crusade on which Mr. Churchill embarked with no less flourish than the circumstances justified, could not be converted into a national picnic without abandoning the policy typified in Mr. Butler's Budget, the policy of keeping enough central control to protect the weak against disaster and letting the facts of economic life speak just loudly enough to stimulate effort. If the policy had been energetically pursued, a good many of the crusaders who joined up last November would have contracted out *en route*, but by the end of five years its fruits might have been apparent. As a party tactician no less than a national statesman Mr. Churchill was obliged to defy public opinion, but to do so successfully his Government must be and must appear to be efficient.

The impression is gaining ground that Mr. Churchill is forgetting this fact. Whenever the Prime Minister's reputation is on the decline his critics say the same things about him. He is looking at national politics with the eyes of an Edwardian tactician. He is going in for last-minute improvisation and, most insistent of all, he is keeping bad company. The stock instance of this last vice is said to be his affection for the overlords. The difference between the chairman of a Cabinet committee with co-ordinating functions and a co-ordinator acting as chairman of a Cabinet committee may be small but mishandling and confused statements have certainly made it appear large. Traditionally the bullying of departmental Ministers takes place under the cover of Cabinet secrecy. Yet, if the co-ordinators were politicians with parliamentary ability and the opportunity to exercise it in the Lower House, instead of unorthodox strong men of the kind which Mr. Churchill so often collects about him, less might have been said.

From all this the Government survive, but the still more precarious survival of the Conservative Party depends on its indifference to sudden changes of opinion, and on its broad consistency of policy. Very little that is concrete has yet gone wrong. Mr. Butler is still stopping lending; he has not been panic-stricken by the reappearance of unemployment. But it is right that the warning note should be struck at the first signs of a recrudescence of Churchillian brilliance. The Government's future depend on their not being regarded primarily as an instrument of the Prime Minister's intuitive flare. Mr. Churchill makes as convincing a sage as an *enfant terrible*, and the time for recasting has arrived.

DR. MALAN

BY L. E. NEAME

AMONG the embarrassments of the democratic world must be included Dr. D. F. Malan. At the parades of the western powers and their allies the Prime Minister of the Union of South Africa is apt to fall out of step or even to face in the opposite direction. At one moment he rejects the requests of the United Nations and hints that if they are unduly pressed he will withdraw from the association. At another he tells the British Government that the continued refusal to meet the Union's wishes in the matter of the Protectorate may foment an agitation in favour of republicanism and secession.

Nor can such monitory and minatory utterances be dismissed as mere "talking to Buncombe". Many people in South Africa heartily dislike Dr. Malan and his ideas. But they know that he is a man who does what he says he will do and damns the consequences. To distant on-lookers he may seem to be a modern Dame Partington trying with her mop and her pattens to push back the waves of the democratic ocean. But South Africa is not Sidmouth, and the ideological tempests that blow in the northern hemisphere are very different from those that sweep across the African sub-continent.

To understand Dr. Malan and his policy he must be viewed against his background and his environment. He is the spokesman of an isolated people who for 300 years have been striving to establish a White nation in a Black continent—an effort that Lord Balfour once described as "something that has never before presented itself in the history of mankind." Dr. Malan talks much of democracy and the voice of the "*volk*". But his democracy has the caste structure of that in the Black Belt of the United States. To him the voice of the "*volk*" means the voice of the Whites.

Two basic facts must be remembered by those who would understand the pattern of life in the Union of South Africa. The first is that the Whites are out-numbered by nearly four to one by non-Whites, which means that their outlook is governed by the instinct of self-preservation and the fear of non-White domination. The second is that the majority of the Whites are, and always have been, Dutch. The Union may be a British Dominion. But it is an Afrikaner land. It has never had as Prime Minister a man of British descent. In its cabinets and its parlia-

ments there has always been a majority of Afrikaners.

When Jan Christian Smuts was a boy of 12 tending geese at Riebeeck West in the old Cape Colony, Daniel François Malan, four years younger, was learning his alphabet on a near-by farm. Both attended the village school. Both went on to the Victoria College at Stellenbosch. Then Smuts studied law at Cambridge and returned to South Africa to become an official in Kruger's republic, a general in the Boer War and finally a world statesman. Dr. Malan left college and worked as a teacher while studying for the ministry of the Dutch Reformed Church. He completed his theological training at the University of Utrecht in Holland and returned to the pulpits of the rural Cape. He was a serious-minded young man who held strong views on social and political problems and did not hesitate to ventilate them. Installed in the pulpit of a wine-growing congregation, he preached the virtue of temperance with such vigour that before long he was transferred to minister to the spiritual needs of a sheep-farming area. But most clearly he saw the wrongs suffered by his own people and the misdeeds of British administration and domination.

Having been born a British subject, he took no part in the second Anglo-Boer war, but his sympathies were wholly with the Boers. He was one of the "political *predikants*" who fulminated against Milnerism and all its works. After the formation of the Union of South Africa, Hertzog disagreed with Botha and was ejected from the Cabinet and formed the National Party to preach the gospel of militant Afrikanerism. In 1915 the Nationalists in the Cape launched an Afrikaans daily paper to promote their cause, and Dr. Malan stepped from the pulpit into its editorial chair. He was an eloquent speaker as well as a vigorous writer, and when in 1919 he won a seat in Parliament he retired from journalism and the church and concentrated upon a political career. His maiden speech in the House of Assembly was a declaration of the faith that was in him. Stepping out somewhat in advance even of Hertzog he boldly declared that the Union Jack could never be the expression of the "*volk*" soul of the Afrikaner people and pronounced in favour of republican independence. He closed his almost messianic message with the words:

For Freedom's battle once begun,

Bequeathed from bleeding Sire to Son,

Though often lost, is always won.

Resurgent Afrikaner nationalism was then led by a triumvirate composed of Hertzog in the Orange Free State, Tielman Roos in the Transvaal, and Dr. Malan in the Cape. Hertzog was the acknowledged head of the movement, but his influence was greater in the ex-republics than in the Cape where Dr. Malan controlled *Die Burger*, the biggest and best Nationalist paper in the country.

Hertzog's National Party made many converts, yet after ten years in the wilderness he seemed to be no nearer entering the promised land of

office. But Smuts was forced to strengthen his dwindling ranks by absorbing the English Unionist Party, and Tielman Roos suggested that the Nationalists should enter into an electoral pact with the Labour Party in order to avoid the splitting of the anti-Smuts vote. Dr. Malan's first reaction was against such a move. "Coalition", he declared, "means the continuous trafficking in principles; it means the violation of conscience; it means double-heartedness and dishonesty on the part of political leaders who have to try all the time to placate the most widely differing elements among their supporters. It means the raising of opportunism to the level of statesmanship and the dethronement of principle in order to make way for political lack of character. Under coalition no problem can be tackled or solved in a manly way."

However the agreement was made, and the Pact won the 1924 general election. Dr. Malan became a member of Hertzog's Cabinet despite the fact that it contained two Labour members. He took three portfolios and was elected deputy leader of the National Party in Parliament. He proved a good administrator and his departments were free from racial favouritism. He began to implement the ideas he had expressed on the platform. He supported the abolition of British titles in the Union. He took upon himself the difficult task of providing the Union with its own flag in place of the Union Jack—a change that was so bitterly fought that the Governor-General, the Earl of Athlone, finally intervened in a dispute that threatened to cause civil strife. Dr. Malan put through the measure making Afrikaans the second official language in place of Hollands, or High Dutch, thus carrying to victory a cause that another *predikant* and editor had launched at the *Paarl* 50 years earlier. He reformed the civil service, and the conduct of election, and the Senate. He even tried to reform the press by enacting that during election all letters and reports and leading articles likely to influence votes must bear the name and address of the writer.

The Hertzog administration presented a solid front to the public and won a renewed vote of confidence at the 1929 general election. Then the position gradually deteriorated. Having secured the Statute of Westminster and the acknowledgment of the Union's sovereign independence, Hertzog had no wish to force the issue of republicanism. In the eyes of the more fanatical Nationalists he seemed to be listening to the blandishments of the British and the imperialists and to be adopting an arrogant attitude towards the more aggressive wing of his followers. Militant Afrikanerdom began to murmur that "the General" had been softened by his visits to London and was inclined to bow the knee to Baal. Discontent came to a head when the Union was forced off the gold standard at the end of 1932. Hertzog was persuaded to join with his life-long opponent Smuts in forming a coalition government to see the country through the financial and economic crisis. Dr. Malan refused to enter

the coalition cabinet and later, when Hertzog and Smuts decided upon the fusion of their parties into the United Party, he solemnly denounced the merger and persuaded his Cape National Party to vote against it and remain in being as the *Herenigde* (purified) National Party.

Thus like Hertzog in 1913, Dr. Malan created a schism in the ranks of the Afrikaners. Like Hertzog then, he went into the wilderness almost alone. He presented himself as the sea green incorruptible of Afrikanerdom crying in the spirit of Elijah that the priests of fusion had forsaken the old covenants and thrown down the old altars and that he, even he only, was left as the defender of the true faith. Like Hertzog he seemed to have sacrificed his political career. In a House of Assembly of 153 members only 18 followed him into the lobby. But in racial politics nothing succeeds like excess. Hopelessly outnumbered in Parliament, like Anateus, he renewed his strength by contact with mother earth—Afrikanerdom in the rural areas. He stood high in the esteem of the *predikants* of the Dutch churches. He was a member of that mysterious body the *Broederbond* which had been denounced by Smuts and Hertzog as a secret anti-British society pledged to make the Afrikaner *baas* in South Africa.

Whether Dr. Malan, like Hertzog 20 years earlier, would have won the majority of the Afrikaners to his side one cannot say with confidence. The outbreak of the 1939-1945 war brought a touch of drama to the political kaleidoscope. The Hertzog-Smuts alliance crashed on the rock of neutrality. Hertzog was defeated in the Cabinet and in Parliament and resigned and rejoined the National Party. There was much rejoicing at the return of the prodigal son but the harmony was short-lived. Hertzog was not forgiven for his coalition with Smuts and the English in 1933. He found his advice rejected, and in 1941 he retired from Parliament and politics. Dr. Malan was left the unchallenged leader of the Nationalists. He was defeated by the Smuts party at the wartime election of 1943, but with the close of the struggle the conditions became more favourable for his side. Communism was spreading and the Coloured races were claiming equality. The cry of Asia for the Asians re-echoed in the Union as Africa for the Africans. Malan stepped to the front with the policy he called *Apartheid* (separation) which he claimed could alone ensure the survival of the White race. War weariness and the high cost of living told against the Government. Smuts, like Winston Churchill in Britain's first post-war election, was defeated at the polls.

A fortnight after he had entered upon his 75th year, and 33 years after he had left the pulpit for the press and politics, Daniel François Malan became Prime Minister. He formed the first wholly Afrikaner government in the history of the Union. No representative of the English section had a seat in his Cabinet. The wheel had turned full circle. At the opening of the twentieth century the administration of all South

Africa had been purely British. Now it was purely Dutch. But the margin of victory had been a narrow one. The Nationalists had been in a minority of 140,000 in the polling booths. They had a majority of only one in the Senate and seven in the Assembly. Dr. Malan set himself the task of entrenching himself in office. He restored the franchise to the thousands of Germans in South West Africa who had been deprived of it under the Smuts régime. The bread cast upon the waters returned in the form of six Nationalist seats in the Union House of Assembly, thus raising his majority to 13. There were, too, on the voters' roll in the Cape some 48,000 Coloured men who held the balance in six or eight constituencies and always voted against the Nationalists. They had been protected by a clause in the South Africa Act providing that their electoral rights could be changed only by a two-thirds majority in Parliament. It was a safeguard that Hertzog and many of Dr. Malan's own supporters had declared, 15 years earlier, was inviolable. Despite those solemn pledges Dr. Malan persuaded himself that the entrenchment was merely "the dead hand of the past" and could not for all time bind the sovereign "*volkswil*" of South Africa. By a bare majority in Parliament he removed the Coloureds from the common roll, thus vastly increasing the chance of Malanites being returned in half-a-dozen seats in the Cape now held by the United Party Opposition.

He halted the large-scale immigration from Great Britain which had been a feature of Smuts' post-war policy, and encouraged the importation of technicians from Holland, Germany and Belgium. The law giving new-comers the right to become Union nationals after two years' residence was altered and the qualifying period extended to five years. He began to apply the policy of *Apartheid* in all public offices, and made sexual relations between Whites and non-Whites a penal offence. He passed anti-Communist laws of so drastic a character that by ministerial edict individuals could be deprived of their business, and barred from holding public office, and removed to specified residential areas, without the right of appeal to the courts. He rejected the claim of the United Nations to exercise any measure of supervision over the mandated territory of South West Africa and announced that in due course the Union would ask for the transfer of the High Commission territories of Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland even if the Natives in them opposed the change.

Dr. Malan's Government have had a bad press both at home and abroad. Critics from China to Peru fulminate against his ideology and denounce his administration as reactionary and totalitarian. In the Union the ex-soldier "torch commandos" seek to defend the liberty for which they fought. The members of the United Party are girding up their loins for a gigantic effort to defeat Malanism at the next general election—due in 1953 at the latest—and are already calling upon all right-minded men

to prevent the entrenchment of a party whose Colour policy and neo-Nazi temper are likely to bring down unpredictable dangers upon South Africa.

The leaders of the Natives, encouraged by the news of happenings in Nigeria and the Gold Coast and elsewhere under British colonial policy, say bluntly that they will accept nothing less than the granting of full democratic rights enabling them eventually to take over the government of the country. Dr. Malan in not bowing before these storms probably feels that they may be made to blow in his favour. Criticism and threats from without are often emotional assets on the side of militant nationalism. So he clings doggedly to his policy of *Apartheid*, convinced that it expresses the voice of the "*volk*" and that given enough rope those who oppose him will hang themselves before the next election comes.

In the eyes of his opponents Dr. Malan is an obstinate old man who is angered by a hostile press and what he regards as the deliberate misrepresentations of his enemies, and so will make no conciliatory gesture. They see him only as a bigoted zealot who has closed his mind to the changes of the post-war world and still proposes to solve the problems of the mid-twentieth century by the methods of the mid-nineteenth—a fanatic who has survived into an age he does not understand.

But Dr. Malan is an astute politician, quick to sense the emotional atmosphere of his country and to play upon the instinct of self-preservation that always lies near the surface among Europeans dwelling in a land in which they are outnumbered by non-Europeans. The first and last cartridge in the armoury of Malanism is the maintenance of the supremacy of the White race. And when Dr. Malan appeals to the people he will deny that there is any other issue. He stands as the unflinching champion of the White man, proclaiming his faith in the righteousness of his cause and crying like Luther of old: "There I take my stand. I can do naught else, so help me God. Amen."

To the observer oversea the Malan policy may seem to be hag-ridden by Colour prejudice and having no moral, ethical or scientific basis. But those who know South Africa best will be least inclined to underestimate the electoral value of his appeal to a White race struggling to survive at the foot of a Black continent.

(The author, formerly the editor of the Rand Daily Mail (Johannesburg) and the Cape Argus (Cape Town), writes from South Africa.)

ECUADOR

By N. P. MACDONALD

GRASPING, as it were, the western slopes of the Andes to avoid slipping into the Pacific, Ecuador tends to be dismissed as signifying little in the Latin American picture. Yet it is a country of respectable size, although its exact area is uncertain because of a frontier dispute with neighbouring Peru; the lowest estimate is 176,000 square miles, or a little less than pre-war Germany, while the highest is 276,000 square miles, only slightly less than the area of Spain and Italy combined. Ecuador in any case occupies, with Colombia and Venezuela, a special place in the history of Spanish America; for these three now separate republics composed the State of Great Colombia founded by Simon Bolivar as the nucleus of the federation which he sought to build of the newly-freed Spanish colonies. But Ecuador was the least important of the three components of that State. Indeed, throughout the history of the Spanish Empire the province of Quito—as Ecuador was then known—had been of little significance. It suffered a geographical isolation which continued to affect its independent history. That history began in 1830 when the State of Great Colombia, which had none but artificial unity, dissolved once more into the old Spanish administrative areas from which it had been formed.

Thenceforward Ecuador was to follow an independent path marked not less by internal dissensions than were the careers of her late partners. Thus Juan José Flores, Venezuelan-born chief architect of Ecuadorean independence, remained in power for 15 years before revolution initiated a period of military dictatorship which lasted until 1860. There then appeared as ruler of Ecuador one of the most interesting characters to be found anywhere in Latin America at that time. Gabriel Garcia Moreno, who has been described as “one of the greatest personalities of American history,” was very different from the usual Spanish American *caudillos* of the period. Like them he championed a cause in which he ardently believed, but his cause was the Church, not himself. In that he was not out of place against the contemporary background of his country's politics, for they were dominated by the religious issue. During the latter part of the nineteenth century Ecuador was ruled by men who alternately upheld and attacked the privileges of the Church. For his part Garcia Moreno attempted to give the fullest expression to what he considered to be the inherent conservatism of his fellow countrymen. He negotiated

a concordat with the Holy See, and encouraged the Jesuits and other religious orders. His constitution of 1869 declared Roman Catholicism to be the State religion of Ecuador to the exclusion of all other creeds, and he even went so far as to advocate the re-establishment of the Inquisition.

In 1875 Garcia Moreno was assassinated on the steps of the cathedral at Quito, and under succeeding presidents the Church was to pay dearly for the privileges it had enjoyed under his rule. By 1906 liberty of conscience was assured, education had been secularized, and the constitution of that year contained no reference to a State religion. The constitution of 1929 and that of 1946 confirmed these provisions. To-day ecclesiastical property has been nationalized, some of it being entrusted by the State to the continued use of the Church.

Concentration by successive governments on the religious and other political issues resulted in neglect of the wider development of the country. This has also been hampered by geographical considerations. Externally Ecuador was, until the opening of the Panama Canal, so much cut off from the outer world that neither European nor United States influence was greatly felt. The few foreigners in the country were of small significance, and there was little immigration except from neighbouring countries. Internally Ecuador has suffered, like Peru and Bolivia, from geographical division. The country falls naturally into three distinct regions—the coastal belt, the Andean plateau and the tropical lowlands of the east, the latter known locally as the *Oriente*. This trisection of the country for long hampered economic development in Ecuador, and the obstacles it presents have not yet been entirely overcome. Thus the coastal belt, with the main port of Guayaquil, was for many years—and in many respects remains—the centre of the country's economic life, although it is inhabited by only 500,000 of the total estimated population of 2,000,000. There sawmills, breweries and other industrial enterprises have grown up alongside the 6,000 estates which grow cocoa, which long accounted for the major part of Ecuador's exports. There, too, are valuable oilfields, while yet another contribution of the coastal region to Ecuadorean economy is, somewhat unexpectedly, the Panama hat. This is made from the fibre of the *toquilla* palm, and its manufacture—essentially a village craft—is carried on in countless small homes.

To-day Guayaquil still has a larger population than the capital; for Quito, even now, has not quite conquered the somnolence to which it became accustomed in Spanish times. It was an established centre of population long before the coming of the Spaniards, for it was a prominent city of the Inca Empire, and was linked with the Inca capital at Cuzco by the famous Andean road, more than 500 miles long, of which parts still exist. But the Spaniards found the wealth of Peru and Bolivia more attractive than the apparent poverty of Ecuador, and so Quito became

the backwater it has remained until recent times. It had poor access to the sea—the journey took a week until the railway reduced the time of the trip to two days—and no trade radiated from it, nor was anything of value produced in its vicinity. The isolated capital of an almost isolated country thus became little more than the cock-pit in which rival politicians argued, and sometimes fought, out their differences to such an extent that for many years the rulers of Ecuador had no time to take measures to purge the coast of yellow fever. This scourge prevailed there long after it had been banished from other tropical areas in Latin America, and, as a result, Ecuador's trade was severely affected.

Yet the isolation of Ecuador as a whole, and of the various regions within the country, has had one significant result, for it has enabled her large Indian population to maintain its cohesion to a very much greater extent than has been the case in the other so-called Indian republics, Peru and Bolivia. When the Spaniards dismissed Ecuador as a comparatively poor country the Indians were assured of freedom from the labour in the mines which so greatly contributed to the de-population of other Indian areas. Indeed, up to the end of colonial rule in Ecuador Spanish authority remained restricted to the immediate neighbourhood of Quito, and so did not affect the majority of the natives. The Indians thus remained strong, so much so that children of mixed marriages were often entirely absorbed into the Indian population. The strength of the Indians in Ecuador to-day must also be credited to the not unenlightened policy pursued towards them by successive governments.

The Indians of Ecuador do not form a majority of the population as in Peru and Bolivia. Of the 2,000,000 inhabitants they account for 675,000 being outnumbered by the *mestizos*, or half-breeds, of whom there are 915,000. In contrast, the white population numbers only 10 per cent. of the whole, compared with 15 per cent. in Peru and Bolivia. Yet, although the *mestizos* form a majority of the population, the Indians have not been victimized by them to so great a degree as have the Indians in Peru and Bolivia. In Ecuador the State possesses a large number of mountain farms originally owned by the Church and later confiscated. Some of these have been divided into plots and sold to the Indians on easy terms. As a result it is claimed that few Indians in Ecuador occupy a status in any way comparable to the servitude in which live the Indians of Peru and Bolivia. Again, although the Ecuadorean Indians are seldom able to produce more cereals than suffice for their own needs, they have been able to breed cattle. Aided by the demand for cattle in Ecuador they have been able to put themselves in a better position than would have been theirs had they been forced to labour on the land of others. Indeed, in many areas the Indians have been able to retain the system of communal land holdings which were the basis of their existence even before their conquest by the Incas. In northern Ecuador a large

number of Indian communities own thousands of acres of small holdings, carefully tilled and planted. They preserve many distinct characteristics of dialect and costume which are in large part attributable to late conquest and imperfect absorption by the Inca Empire. Altogether the Indians of Ecuador are a significant part of the community, and that fact has been recognized by successive governments. The Indians were granted rights of citizenship in 1896, although they have since played little part in political life; and only the other day a group of representative Indians from the Chimborazo province visited the President of the Republic to explain some grievances which had led their communities to refuse to give certain particulars to census officials. The President replied with a promise to visit the Indians to see things for himself, and instructed the Ministry of Social Welfare to set up a special commission to ensure that Indians were in fact enjoying the same rights as their fellow citizens.

Yet, compared with this progressive treatment of the Indians, Ecuador has so far achieved little general social progress. Although compulsory social insurance for workers was introduced in 1935 general social legislation remains backward, even by Latin American standards. Since 1926 there has been a Ministry of Social Welfare whose inspectors are empowered to pay annual visits to establishments coming within their authority. Nevertheless Ecuador has been slow in ratifying the conventions approved by the Washington Labour Conference of 1919 governing such matters as hours of work, night work for women, the age of admission of children to industrial employment and unemployment benefits. For wages, payments in kind still continue, as they do in many other Latin American republics with backward agricultural populations. In Ecuador payment for agricultural labour is often less than a shilling a day. Nor is the industrial worker in much better case. There are few large enterprises and production is mainly concentrated among isolated craftsmen, each employing a small number of workers at a minimum wage. As a result the average standard of living has never been high.

Progress in the field of education has also been slow. Throughout Ecuador education is free and nominally compulsory, and in 1947 about half the children of primary school age were receiving instruction. Efforts to educate adult illiterates have had some success, but the proportion of the population unable to read or write remains high. A high percentage of illiteracy and racial differences are two factors which have always hampered the introduction of practical democracy in Latin America. In this Ecuador is no different from the other heirs to the Spanish and Portuguese empires. Since 1934 the country has had no fewer than 11 presidents or provisional chief executives. The present head of the State, President Galo Plaza Lasso, is the twelfth, and the first to serve the full term of four years. But just as Ecuador shares the social causes

of political instability with the rest of Latin America so she shares the economic causes—petty regionalism bred by poor communications, and dependence on virtually a single export. This, as already mentioned, has been cocoa, sold chiefly to the United States. But production has been declining in recent years, and rice exports have been growing in importance, although, like cocoa, rice is subject to fluctuations in world prices. The production of cotton and sugar is increasing, and bananas are beginning to play a part in Ecuadorean exports. Not least, Ecuador enjoys a virtual monopoly in supplying the world with balsa wood. When the Spaniards arrived in Ecuador they found in use rafts constructed of very lightweight logs. Thus the Spanish word *balsa*, or raft, became applied to the tree from which the wood came.

Broader economic development in Ecuador depends primarily on the improvement of communications. Some roads have been built in recent years, but the total railway mileage is still under 1,000 and large areas remain untouched by modern transport. Inadequate communications have also been responsible for the neglect by Ecuador of the Galapagos islands, which lie some 60 miles off her coast. The islands have long been famed for giant turtle, but it is not so well-known that many of them bear English names, a reminder of visits by famous navigators and buccaneers in days gone by. Thus the principal island of the group, although officially named Isabela, is more generally known as Albemarle; the next largest, Santa Cruz, bears the very un-Spanish name of Indefatigable, while other islands are known as Narborough and Chatham. Only the first and last named islands have been developed to any extent, principally by the planting of sugar. But lately the world demand for sulphur has led to renewed interest in the sulphur mines on the islands which thus promise to add to the contribution they have already made to the defence of the free world; during the last war the United States were granted the right to build bases there to protect the western end of the Panama Canal.

Altogether Ecuador possesses great possibilities for economic development. But plans for that development, so far as they concern the *Oriente*, are overshadowed by the dispute over this region between Ecuador and her Peruvian neighbours. The quarrel concerns a region which Alexander von Humboldt prophesied would one day be the storehouse of the world. Andean peaks and tropical forest lands, potentially rich in bananas, rubber, coffee and timber, and in which Indians may be found panning gold in the rivers, all have their place in it. Peru and Ecuador both claim the region on the ground of being an Amazon power. Peru is already astride the headwaters of the Amazon, including the Marañon, and the natural outlet of half Peru is through the port of Iquitos and down the Amazon. Ecuador, on the other hand, has only poorly-developed communications with the upper Amazon, but is insistent on

her right to an outlet down that river.

The origins of the dispute are traceable to the imprecision of Spanish colonial laws. Thus the *Cédula* of November 29, 1563, assigned to the province of Quito (Ecuador) lands bounded "on the east by provinces not yet discovered or civilized." At the same time the *Audiencia* of Lima (Peru) was also bounded on the east by "the undiscovered provinces." There was thus a ready-made bone of contention when Peru and Ecuador achieved their independence. In 1821 the first republican government in Lima invited the inhabitants of the disputed territory to elect representatives to the Congress in Lima. Colombia, with which Ecuador was then incorporated, at once protested, and the quarrel had begun. Negotiations followed, and a treaty agreeing that the boundary should be defined was signed in 1829. But the work of demarcation went on slowly, and when Ecuador became independent of Colombia she inherited an unsettled problem.

Altogether there have been some 13 attempts to resolve it. Forty years ago the dispute was submitted to the late King Alfonso of Spain, but he renounced the rôle of arbitrator when Ecuador showed herself unwilling to accept his mediation. Later the United States, Brazil and Argentina tried, but failed, to take the issue to the International Court at the Hague. In 1936 Peru and Ecuador agreed to respect the provisional frontier. But border incidents continued until the outbreak of what amounted to war between the two countries in 1941. After six weeks hostilities were brought to an end by the offer of the United States, Brazil, Argentina and, subsequently Chile, to arbitrate. In August 1941 Peru and Ecuador both accepted a protocol, which they signed at Rio de Janeiro early in 1942, and which allocated to Peru about half the disputed area of 100,000 square miles. Since then a joint Peruvian-Ecuadorean boundary commission has been working on the demarcation of the frontier. But progress has been slow, and there have been signs that the quarrel may flare up once more.

Altogether Ecuador, like each of the Central and South American republics, is an individual country with its individual problems. But some of those problems depend for their solution on yet other problems which affect the whole of Latin America—the improvement of education and the standard of living which, in their turn, depend on the provision of sufficient resources for extensive and well-organized capital development.

LABOUR PARTY POLICY IN TRANSITION

BY GILBERT McALLISTER

THERE are two ways of looking at the Attlee-Bevan controversy. The press—for the most part opposed to the Labour Party—prefers to depict it as a struggle between two men for power. A more charitable, and almost certainly the more correct view is to see the controversy as symptomatic of a party whose soul and mind are in ferment, which has reached a degree of fulfilment but is troubled and does not see clearly the way ahead. It could hardly be otherwise. The 1945 Labour Government carried through nothing less than a social revolution in which they gave legislative sanction to practically every ideal ever expressed by the early pioneers and leaders; whose words and lives were still the predominating influence and stimulus and from whom the British Labour Party acquired its peculiar characteristics, its moral and intellectual superiority to every other brand of Socialism preached or applied in any country in the world. For 50 years “the movement” had sought to give a fair deal to the miners through the State ownership of the mines. It had subscribed to every attempt (and had initiated many of the early efforts) to provide a basic platform of security and social service, freely available to the poorest in the land and lifting them above the possibility of want in sickness or in health, in work or in unemployment, in infancy or in old age. It had led the housing movement from its beginnings and although other Governments had to take the legislative action that was necessary to open the attack on the nineteenth century legacy of slumdom, squalor and overcrowding, there can be no doubt that it was the Labour Party in and outside the House of Commons which formulated the demands of the impoverished victims of appalling congestion and slum conditions.

The 1945 Labour Government put through a volume of legislation unparalleled in the history of Parliament. In fulfilling for the most part the dreams of the early pioneers they created a void, a policy vacuum that has not yet been filled.

Should the Party proceed to further measures of nationalization? What sectors of private enterprise should be nationalized? Even in 1950 these were the great interrogation marks—answered under the stress and exigencies of the February General Election by the words “Sugar, Cement, Insurance.” Little thought had been given to the case for nationalizing the insurance industry. Perhaps the best work on the

subject had been written by the late Sir Arnold Wilson, a Conservative member of Parliament, and on his showing there was no doubt that the case for the public control of the great insurance companies was overwhelming. But the major premise of that case had been incidentally destroyed by the formulation and application of the great national insurance scheme itself. With everyone compelled to subscribe to social security there disappeared automatically the need for the shilling-a-week-man and the vast alchemy whereby one insurance company alone extracted £66,000,000 a year in modest contributions against "funeral benefits" and gave back to the subscribers £33,000,000 a year. In the more comprehensive scheme originated by Lord Beveridge and piloted through the House by Mr. James Griffiths, the need for such private insurance disappeared and with it much of the case for the nationalization of the insurance industry. It was realized, too, that evil as some aspects had been, the insurance industry was an enormous dollar earner and owed its world-wide reputation and trade to a trust in the City of London, felt by people in every part of the world. Cement? Cement was a monopoly. All monopolies are bad and should be owned by the State. Therefore cement should be nationalized. Sugar? Mr. Cube was the personal property of Mr. Tate and Mr. Lyle. Certainly sugar should be nationalized. It was only a little belatedly that the originators of the proposal realized that the Co-operative movement, closely allied to the British Labour Party, owned almost as much of the British sugar industry as Mr. Tate and Mr. Lyle combined.

Little is heard of these proposals to-day. Instead a very considerable school of thought believes that nationalization has gone almost far enough and that it is important to prove that the nationalized industries can be successful before embarking on further experiments. The State corporation—derived from the example of the authorized association of the housing movement and later more widely applied in the charter of the B.B.C. and in Mr. Morrison's creation of the London Passenger Transport Board—became the model for all the Labour Government efforts at State ownership and control. Gnawing doubts about the machinery of nationalization arose when a Labour Member of Parliament attempted to put down on the Order Paper a question dealing with the work of one of these corporations only to find it disallowed by the Table on the grounds that it was an attempt to interfere with the day-to-day administration of a corporation for which no Minister had either power or responsibility. The theoretical advantage of the State corporation was that it was not subject to ministerial or parliamentary control—in other words it was not part of the Civil Service machine and was not subject to the day-to-day interference of the Treasury. In practice it was seen that the State corporation had the worst of both worlds. It had none of the freedom of private enterprise with the maximum of Treasury

interference and control and it had a lack of answerability to Parliament which diminished, if it did not destroy, its democratic sanction.

Mr. Aneurin Bevan, admitting his share of responsibility for this state of affairs, has now reached the point of view that State-owned industries should be administered directly by the State through the ordinary machinery of the Civil Service. It is doubtful whether this would be an improvement but it is typical of the kind of problem that the Labour Party must resolve if it is to go forward confidently with a programme based on classic Socialist economic principles.

Mr. Herbert Morrison who believes in the mixed economy was once so bold as to say that he believed in 25 per cent. Socialism. Mr. Bevan would obviously fix the figure much higher than that. Mr. Churchill would probably put it at 15 per cent. But it is at least worth remembering that in the House of Commons to-day from Mr. Churchill to Mr. Bevan there is no-one, with the possible exception of Sir Waldron Smithers, who believes either in one hundred per cent. private enterprise or in one hundred per cent. Socialism.

There was, too, the remarkable discovery daringly put into words by Mr. Richard Stokes, that profits are somehow important. "You cannot", said Mr. Stokes, speaking more to his colleagues than to the then Opposition, "run an industry to break even. Either you must make a profit or a loss. It is much better to make a profit." It is true that B.O.A.C. is now making a profit. Mr. Bevan is optimistic enough to believe that by greatly extending the field of nationalization the profits of the nationalized industries would provide a large part of the national revenue. That is hypothetical but, ignoring the hypothesis, even the most ardent Socialist might well pause to consider whether in fact the nationalized industries should be regarded as revenue undertakings. Is it reasonable that the Post Office should make vast profits at the expense of the user of the Post Office? Have all Governments and all parties abandoned the idea of the 1d. stamp and do they all regard the 2d. charge for a post-card and the 2½d. charge for a letter as fully justified because it is a convenient way of collecting revenue? This indeed is to enshrine the profit motive in a new way but it is singularly to depart from the idea of a State service. One of the basic ideals of the Socialist movement was that those industries which were essential services for the whole community should be operated socially in order that the whole community might enjoy the benefits of the service. It was indeed the basic idea of the whole school of Fabian political theory evolved by the Webbs which came to be known as "gas and water socialism." Mr. Bevan may conceivably be right but it would require much closer and more detailed argument than the thesis he put forward in his recent testament.

Underlying the question of the form and extent of Socialism there are questions which have been more fully and searchingly discussed by back-

benchers as to whether Socialism should be consumer-socialism or producer-socialism and as to how far competitive-socialism is a good idea. The Socialism practised by the 1945 Government was in the main producer-socialism. The nationalization of the mining industry benefited the miners—a highly desirable thing. It is open to question whether it greatly benefited the rest of the community as consumers and it is as consumers that the miner and the steelworker and the railwayman form part of the general social community in whose interests the State must act. For the question each industry, whether private or public, must answer is: "Does this industry as at present organized and administered, and while providing fair conditions for the workers at all levels in the industry, best serve the interests of the general body of citizens as consumers?" This is a test of Socialist efficiency which would not provide an unequivocal answer if applied to all industries already nationalized. On the other hand, some industries at present in private hands might quite readily make out a substantial case for the view that they are providing at one and the same time good conditions and opportunities for their workers and an excellent service to the community. Then there is the question of competitive Socialism.

The State, let us suppose, takes a look at an industry which manifestly is functioning imperfectly. That I think would be a reasonable description of the cinema industry to-day. Should the State therefore nationalize the cinema industry? Is the State capable of providing the kind of machinery that would allow the necessary liberty—because even to contemplate nationalizing the cinema industry is a little like contemplating nationalizing the press—to producers, writers and artists? If the answer to that is 'no', should the State therefore say we must leave it as it is? Or should the State say we shall take over some of the surplus studio space of the existing industry and we shall run State studios producing State films of a commercial character in open competition with Mr. Rank, Associated British, Warner Brothers and the whole might of Hollywood? It would at least be a fair challenge alike to Socialism and to private enterprise. Similarly in the field of film distribution; it may be, although the vast majority of cinemas are owned individually or in very small groups, that the great circuits are too large and too powerful. Would it be reasonable to go further than that and for the State to acquire from the major circuits at reasonable prices a fair cross section of their cinemas—ranging from the London *première* cinema to the modest hall in a country town—and on that basis to enter into strictly commercial competition with the existing circuits? Within the Parliamentary Labour Party there are quite a number who think that there is much to be said in favour of competitive-socialism. Those Socialists who would immediately repudiate the idea should at least consider whether they are not instantly condemning Socialism as an inefficient industrial

instrument, if they are not saying in fact that Socialism cannot be successful except when it enjoys complete monopoly conditions. One of the leaders of the building trades unions has declared that the building industry should be nationalized. It is a tempting proposition. Bearing in mind the fact that there are over 40,000 individual building firms in the United Kingdom it may be doubted whether it is a practical proposition but is there any reason why the State should not establish one or two large-scale building organizations to tender in open and fair competition* with the existing private enterprise organizations?

Mr. Bevan is rightly concerned with industrial efficiency but he believes that the managerial revolution is a frightful conception. That is as may be but few would deny that the advance in economic standards which the members of the Labour Party believe must attend every development of Socialist practice cannot be achieved unless industrial output, including agricultural output, is increased enormously. This cannot be done in an atmosphere of restrictive practices on either side of industry—in the refusal of the building trades unions to adopt the bricklayer's jig which makes bricklaying almost child's play or in the restrictive covenants that now operate on the employers' side between some of the largest industrial concerns in the country. Mr. Bevan is unwise to diminish the status of management especially as he should remember that just as he himself came from a mining community so most of the managers in British industry to-day came from a completely working-class background. Only a small number of managers in industry to-day enter with an inheritance of loaded dice.

Bound up with this consideration is the more immediate question of inflation and national solvency. Are wages for ever to chase rising prices, or can wages get a jump ahead of prices and a period of reasonable equilibrium ensue? The Trades Union Congress resisted with all its force the application of a national wages policy. Is a national wages policy possible and is the Labour Party prepared to formulate it? It has become clear to almost everyone that there is no final solution to present economic ills so long as the re-armament burden remains so heavy. It is here that all the sections of the Labour Party begin to meet on common ground. The hard economic facts of our time, the whole teaching of the New and the Old Testaments combine to say that the policy of love thy neighbour is the right one—hence Point Four, hence the Colombo Plan, hence the United Nations, hence UNESCO, hence the projected Four Power talks, hence the idea of Government on a world scale.

If the British Labour Party failed in any important respect in the period since the war it was especially, and to the degree, that it abandoned the Party's traditional ideal of international and supra-national

* Municipal "direct labour" schemes have seldom competed on level terms with private enterprise. Their overheads did not usually enter into their estimates.

co-operation. It was understandable that British Socialists should be horrified even more than British Conservatives at the hard and sometimes vile application of socialist theory in the Soviet Union. Much as many Conservatives dislike them, it is in the Labour Party that one finds real hatred both for Communists and Communism. Yet somehow the miracle of east-west co-operation must be achieved if the world is to be saved from disaster. If one accepts the validity of the thesis that as the result of the combined re-armament programme of Britain and the United States we shall in 1953 be able to negotiate from strength the question still remains: "What then?" What of the gigantic productive power of the United States? Is it to run to a standstill as in the 'thirties bringing a worldwide "economic blizzard" in its train? Or is the great productive power of the west to be used to give to the peoples of Africa, India and Asia a higher standard of living and a longer life span than they have ever enjoyed? Here at least there is agreement. Here there is the basis of a common policy.

Mr. Morrison, alone of all the Socialist front rank leaders, shows himself willing to follow the argument wheresoever it may lead. Mr. Morrison is so brilliant in handling some of the more superficial aspects of political life that both his friends and his enemies are lulled into imagining that he is lacking in profundity. They could make no greater mistake. Mr. Morrison devotes more time and thought to the evolution of a policy based at once on ethical and philosophical considerations than most of his colleagues. He has a far firmer grasp of political realities. Although his tenure of the Foreign Office is commonly judged to have been a failure, even that is a doubtful conclusion. Mr. Morrison's speech at Ottawa just before the General Election was one of the greatest policy contributions of British statesmanship in the post-war era.

Whether it is possible to organize the productive resources of the western world for the benefit of the under-developed world without the fabric of world law is the problem which Socialist leaders have shirked but which a substantial body of opinion in both Houses of Parliament has had the courage to voice unequivocally. No one could doubt that the conception of a world system of law which can only arise from a world system of Government is in tune with the deepest and best ideals of the early British Labour movement. To betray this ideal is to betray mankind. The rule of law is the sanction and the foundation of a free society; it is equally the sanction and the foundation of a world at peace. Here indeed is the crux of the matter and almost every other problem fades into insignificance.

This resolved, there are many other problems on which the Labour Party must make up its mind. The British Labour movement has its roots deep in Christian teaching; this is its distinctive characteristic which makes it superior to its counterparts in any other country. Keir

Hardie, the Bruce Glasiers, George Lansbury, Stafford Cripps, were all Socialists; they were all Christians. To them indeed there was no distinction; Christianity and Socialism were interchangeable terms; they worked for the Kingdom of God on earth, believing in the Fatherhood of God, and therefore in the brotherhood of man. It is not merely a distaste for the authoritarian, repressive and sometimes cruel aspects of Soviet Communism that makes the British Socialists reject the theory and the practice; they also reject the whole materialist conception of history and where they are not avowedly Christian they are still the heirs and the trustees of the Christian inheritance.

Even the establishment of the Welfare State—giving us the right proudly to boast that in Britain to-day no-one is in dire poverty who needs be in dire poverty, nor denied medical attention who needs medical attention—is not the end of idealism. Beyond lies the great hope of a world at peace; of men and women living their lives usefully and peacefully in the service of their fellow men. The world stands poised perilously between disaster and triumph. If disaster is to be averted and triumph secured it may be that it will depend on the British Labour movement drinking deep from the wells of its earliest inspirations, proclaiming its belief boldly and going forward, without hatred of class or country but with humility and love, to win the most important battle of all not for the British working class or even for the British people but for all humankind.

(The author was formerly Member of Parliament for Rutherglen.)

AUSTRALIAN IMMIGRATION

BY JOHN MOSS

SINCE the end of the war about 600,000 persons have gone from overseas to settle in Australia, of whom nearly 300,000 have been British. It is remarkable that it should have been possible to absorb this number in a total population of about 8,000,000. Australia would welcome a greater number of migrants from the United Kingdom but its need for increased population is so great that suitable settlers are welcomed from almost any European country. The total number of migrants in 1950 was 175,000 and in 1951, 133,000 of whom 50 per cent were British. There has been an arrangement whereby suitable ex-Servicemen from the United Kingdom with their families have travelled free, but most of those who do not go as full paying passengers pay £10 towards the fare for each adult over 19 years, and £5 for each child from 14 to 18 inclusive. No payment is required for a child who has not reached his fourteenth birthday. The British Government make a grant of £25 a head and the balance of the cost of transport is met by the Commonwealth Government in so far as persons are taken out under the United Kingdom Commonwealth Scheme. There are also schemes under which the various states bring out migrants for special forms of employment, such as for working on the railways. The development of the state railway systems is essential but is much handicapped by the shortage of labour. Recently, therefore, New South Wales sent its immigration officer and a railway expert to the United Kingdom to try to recruit railwaymen for work in that state.

The Commonwealth Government believe that it is imperative to maintain their immigration policy. There is a widespread need for more workers but the need is paramount in what are termed "primary industries", such as forestry and agriculture. Of Australia's labour force of 3,500,000, only about 500,000 are in rural industry. This is 42,000 fewer than when the population was 1,500,000 lower. Australia is maintaining its consumption standards only by eating into the surplus which it should have for export. It is very important for Britain that Australia should maintain, and increase rather than decrease, its export of food-stuffs. As showing the developments in the cities in recent years, it has been pointed out by the Minister for Immigration that Australia has a greater proportion of people in "secondary industry" than has the United States.

Thousands of displaced persons have been placed in forestry work and

saw mills as in other employments. I travelled many miles through forests, particularly in western Australia, and saw the vast resources of timber. I also visited some of the large timber mills and saw the excellent arrangements which are being made to house the employees. Good houses are being provided for families and communal provision for single men. Housing is one of the drawbacks to getting further employees in any industry and it is, therefore, recognized as the duty of the employer, in such industries as timber, to provide houses on the site.

The growing steel industry has also benefited by the immigration of displaced persons and the labour force at two steel works has been increased by 10 per cent. in this way. British migrants—often influenced by their wives—are inclined to seek employment in or near to town and often in one of the capital cities, but migrants from European countries, some of whom have almost forgotten when they had a settled home, are more willing to accept jobs in a rural area if housing is provided.

The large influx of migrants has created a very heavy demand for housing accommodation, so the Commonwealth Government has concentrated on placing migrants largely in industries which can contribute to building construction generally. In order to foster decentralization and to encourage developments in country towns, hostels are being provided in every state and 50 have been completed. Commonwealth-nominated British migrants are being accommodated in ten of these hostels. Each state also has some hostels for state-nominated migrants. For instance, I visited an excellent hostel in Queensland—providing better accommodation than the so called 'first class' hotel where my wife and I were staying—where British migrants and their families are welcomed until they can find their own dwellings. One of the men there was a builder from a small south coast town who migrated with his family because he was tired of the restrictions and controls in England. Some migrants, and particularly European migrants, are doing well in building their own houses—sometimes on a co-operative basis. The present policy of the Commonwealth Government is to bring out about 150,000 migrants in each of the next five years and it is hoped that 63,000 will be British.

Persons brought out under the Displaced Persons Scheme must accept employment found for them by the Department of Labour and National Service and cannot take other employment within two years without the approval of the Department. Agreements were concluded recently with the Netherlands and Italy for the reception of migrants from those countries. Some 40,000 Dutch settlers have already arrived and it is hoped to receive much larger numbers as the accommodation position improves. Under the agreement with Italy it is expected that 15,000 will come during the initial period. Persons brought to Australia under the Assisted Passage Agreements with the Netherlands and Italy are also required to work as directed for a period of two years, but they will be

placed in the type of employment for which they were selected. Another country from which it is hoped to receive a substantial number of carefully selected migrants is western Germany. The introduction of Germans has, however, met with some opposition particularly from the Jewish community. The leading ex-servicemen organization, the Returned Soldiers' League, has endorsed the proposal.

It is recognized that after new settlers have been brought out and placed in employment it is only the community which can promote their complete assimilation as Australians. Very fine work in this connection is being done through the Good Neighbour movement. I was glad to have the opportunity of getting first hand information of the work which is being done by its councils which, in New South Wales and Queensland, are known as New Settlers Leagues. There are now some 75 councils throughout Australia and more are being continually established. A state council acts as a focal point for each state. The great benefit of this scheme is that it brings together so many organizations and influential individuals. They deal with all types of migrants but there is a tremendous feeling of goodwill to any British migrant who gets into difficulty. I am afraid, however, that sometimes help—even substantial help—is taken for granted. I heard of a number of cases in which British migrants had been assisted very considerably. In one case, a man who had migrated with his wife died. Within a few weeks, £1,000 had been raised to pay off the mortgage on the house where the widow was living. One of the most outstanding instances of good neighbourliness of which I heard—and I do not think this was for a British migrant—was where a man bought a small timber house on which he paid a deposit of £100 and agreed to pay the balance by £6 a week. Unfortunately, he had taken no notice of the posters which are displayed in all immigration offices that no-one should buy property without taking proper advice. The seller was unscrupulous, as shown by the action of the health authority in condemning the house shortly after the migrant had taken possession. The local branch of the Good Neighbour council was consulted and during a week-end a team of eight men got together, pulled the house down and built another one on the site. This may seem extraordinary when thinking of English houses but it should be remembered that many in some parts of Australia are of timber-frame construction and are sometimes erected in a man's spare time.

During my visit to Australia, I travelled thousands of miles in all the states. I had ample evidence that many young British men and women have much greater prospects in Australia than they would have at home, provided they are willing to work and provided they, and particularly their wives, do not expect ideal conditions at the start. They may have to live in a hostel for some time before they can get their own home but I was astounded at the housing development which is going on in every

state and, in particular, the encouragement which is given to private building. If a young couple go out together and are both willing to work, they can soon save enough money to pay a deposit on a house and the balance can be readily financed through one of the banks or building societies. The bank will also advance money to enable a man to build his own home as large numbers of the migrants are doing. I heard of a married couple who were both working and who had saved £1,000 in a year. This would, however, be an exceptional case, but it would be quite possible for such a couple to save several hundreds of pounds. If, however, a migrant falls into the habit of some Australians, of spending considerable sums of money on beer (I am not against anyone having a glass of beer) and gambling, then he cannot expect to save. His position would be no worse, and perhaps no better, than if he had remained at home.

I saw the arrival at Fremantle of the *New Australia* which is a wholly migrant ship, refitted by the United Kingdom and Commonwealth Government for the purpose, and sails continually between England and Australia. Her general arrangements, such as lounges and dining rooms, and for meals, correspond with those to be found in any good one-class ship but, as the ship was not built for the tropics, some of the cabins are very hot. Two women welfare officers, employed by the Commonwealth Government, travel in her and give information about the new country to migrants while they are travelling from the United Kingdom. On the ship there were many children with their parents, and there were a few children who were being immigrated under the special scheme for reception into children's institutions in Australia. I also saw several parties of British migrants disembarking from ordinary passenger ships at several ports. Many migrants are privately nominated, others by employers such as public works contractors, railways, and hostels. Others again are state grant nominees; these must go direct to reception centres after arrival, unless they have been able to arrange private accommodation. Their problems and placing in employment are dealt with at the centre. State nominees are usually sent to reception depots at the port and lodgings for the single men and women are soon found. Married men with families are provided with accommodation by their employers. On several occasions I saw the handling of state nominees at the port and was impressed by the friendliness with which all problems were dealt and by the eagerness of the state immigration and employment officials to get the migrants into the most suitable occupations. Female welfare officers attached to the State Department advise single women on employment and tell them about Australian conditions. Excellent accommodation with good meals is provided at the state reception hostels I visited.

Each migrant, other than personal nominees, is encouraged to deposit £2 at Australia House before leaving England so that he may have it available on arrival. Most of them do this; in some cases they spend all

their ready money aboard ship.

Commonwealth migrants under the various European schemes and British migrants who go under the Commonwealth scheme are sent on disembarkation to large reception places, involving a railway journey of up to 190 miles. British migrants disembarking at Sydney are sent to the Bathurst Reception Centre, which is about 140 miles from Sydney, and holds about 5,000. It also takes Dutch migrants. It was used originally by the army and migrants must understand that it is a converted camp and run on camp lines in blocks, each under a supervisor. Conditions are necessarily austere but this is the only type of accommodation which can be used for the reception of large numbers. The migrants are only kept long enough for various formalities to be completed and it is unusual for anyone to be there more than a week. The feeding arrangements are excellent; three good meals are provided daily, and there is a separate kitchen where meals are cooked for children under seven and from which milk is issued as required. The British migrants must find the meal allowance of about six pounds a head a week ample; this is in addition to sausages and rabbits. Other items in the menu include about half-a-pound of fish and six pints of milk.

British, Dutch and Italian migrants arriving under the assisted schemes are allotted employment through the Commonwealth Employment Service usually before they come or within a few days of their arrival at the reception centres which at present operate at Bathurst, N.S.W., and Bonegilla, Victoria. At each of these centres there is a competent staff to do all the necessary work. Including 8,172 Dutch, 13,533 migrants arrived at the Bathurst centre in 36 ships during the year ended August 4, 1951. The initial formalities include the issue of social service documents. There is immediate entitlement to child endowment; in fact, this is paid in respect of a child who is born on the way out. Migrants can also claim unemployment benefit after seven days of unemployment.

There is a school—including a kindergarten—at the centre which is attended by the children of the staff and where children of migrants go for the few days they are there. There is also a good hospital block with an Australian woman doctor in charge who is assisted by several former European doctors who are not, however, entitled to practise in Australia until they have satisfied certain conditions and have been approved by the Australian Medical Association.

British migrants are sent on disembarkation at Melbourne to the other reception centre at Bonegilla on the border of Victoria and New South Wales. This is a town in itself and has accommodation for about 8,000:

- (a) for British migrants.
- (b) for European migrants.

(c) for the dependants of European migrants who are working elsewhere and have to be housed until they can obtain their own accommodation.

The British migrants are in blocks at some distance from the others. This centre was also formerly an army camp. There are separate huts, each family having their own set of rooms. While some of the arrangements—particularly the bathing facilities—must be thought to be rather unsatisfactory, by the women in particular, it must be remembered that it is only a temporary home for them for not more than a week and as the opportunity occurs, the Government will, no doubt, make improvements. For instance, in accordance with Australian custom, the women are expected to use shower baths but these are arranged rather too communally than most of the British migrants would like.

As most of the population in Australia is in the eastern states most migrants other than personal and state nominees are disembarked at Sydney and Melbourne, and go first to Bathurst and Bonegilla. A new workers' hostel with family accommodation is, however, to be opened in western Australia, near Perth. I hope there will be an increasing number of British migrants to this state where the prospects are so good.

Other centres, of which I visited four, are maintained by the Commonwealth Immigration Department for the families of assisted European migrants. One was at Somers, near Melbourne, where there is accommodation for 1,700. The average stay there is six months but some of the husbands get their own places much more quickly. There is a 'hard core' of people who will not exert themselves to this end, but most of the migrants are anxious to get their own homes as soon as possible and sometimes several families co-operate to build or buy a house. There were 16 former nationalities in this hostel but there was no segregation and no racial difficulties apparently arise. The children are taught in schools provided by the state Education Department. I saw them in school and they were a happy, bright lot of youngsters. They soon learn English and sometimes act as interpreters for their mothers. The fathers pick up English at work but the mothers are very backward in this respect. At Somers, as at other camps, English language classes for adults are provided. A charge is made for the accommodation in this type of hostel of £2 for an adult, 30s. for a child over 16 who is working, 20s. for a child from three to 16, and 10s. for a child from 12 months to three years. But there is an overriding maximum charge of £3 10s. 0d. a week for one family. Bearing in mind that the basic minimum wage for a man is now more than £10 a week, and there are very few who do not earn more than the basic wage, any man who is keen to get a home together has the opportunity of saving which is made still more easy if the wife also works. (Wages are higher than in Britain; as is the cost of living.)

Another centre which I visited in Victoria is at Benalla where there were 259 families of Displaced Persons including 434 children. Here 90

women were employed in a textile factory nearby where, after training, a woman could earn from £8 to £11 a week. More women could be employed in this factory so arrangements were being made to transfer some women from a centre in western Australia, which I visited later, as there they had no such opportunity. The husbands are encouraged to visit their families during weekends. The educational and other arrangements are of the generally prevailing high standard as elsewhere. The centre which I visited at Cowra, in New South Wales, had 800 wives and 2,000 children of European migrants who were working elsewhere, most of them employed at Canberra about 130 miles away and travelling by bus to the centre for the weekends.

Besides the Commonwealth Immigration Department centres, there are hostels administered by the Department of Labour and National Service for the families of men in employment and where the husbands also live. I visited one of these hostels on the outskirts of Melbourne where there was accommodation for about 1,000 families. Each family has two or more rooms built inside large wool stores shaped rather like aeroplane hangars. This hostel is entirely for British migrants, who remain until they are able to get their own accommodation. The feeding is communal in separate blocks; one dining room, where my wife and I had the excellent evening meal provided for migrants, serves 600 people on the cafeteria principle from a kitchen with equipment which could not be surpassed in any hotel in Australia. A very considerable sum has been spent by the Government on this building. The general arrangements are good except for the very depressing appearance of the buildings from the outside.

All the men are in good employment in Melbourne and many of them are earning £20 a week. Individual savings up to £1,000 are not unusual before a family leaves the centre. Some women go out to work. As showing their comparative affluence, there were about 100 trucks (or lorries) and motor cars in the camp belonging to the men. The charge is on rather a higher basis than in the reception centres, but there is an overriding condition that each man must be left with at least £2 a week of his basic wage, not taking into account overtime or child endowment.

As I have already said, Australia offers great prospects to willing British migrants but one difficulty which must be preventing some suitable young people from accepting these opportunities is that often the young husband or wife does not want to leave a mother behind in Britain. There are, at present, no reciprocal arrangements in relation to the social services so a young couple must face the possibility of having to maintain a parent, particularly a mother, if he or she goes with them. Reciprocity with the United Kingdom is needed, first, as a measure of social justice and, secondly, as an important aid to the Government's plans to speed up the inflow of British migrants. It was considered at a conference of

officials from the various countries of the British Commonwealth held in London in 1947 when the then Minister of National Insurance, Mr. J. Griffiths, said that if ways and means of overcoming the technical difficulties in the way of reciprocity could be found, not only would it be a very great boon to people moving from one country to another but there would be a benefit of a wider and more general character in that

every step forward in the direction of reciprocity in social insurance is also a step forward in the direction of breaking down the barriers that divide mankind.

The matter has since been raised between representatives of the two Governments on several occasions and it is to be hoped that a solution will soon be found. I discussed the matter with Mr. A. Townley, the Commonwealth Minister for Social Services, who agreed it should be settled.

At present, British migrants arriving in Australia above the age of 45 for men, or 40 for women, cannot receive an age pension at 65 (or 60 for a woman), but must wait until they have completed 20 years' residence. In many cases this means that the pension cannot be received until a considerable time after the normal working span of life has ended. It seems unfair that migrants, who have contributed to the National Insurance Fund of the United Kingdom for many years and, on leaving for Australia, cease their contributions and subsequently contribute by taxation to the Australian fund, should lose the right to receive, at the normal age, the benefits which they would have received had they remained in the United Kingdom, and have to wait until they complete the full residential period. Many of these people have young families which would be a great asset to Australia, and naturally they would migrate more readily if they felt they would be given the same entitlement to pensions, should they need them, as other citizens of Australia at the normal qualifying age. A person who receives a contributory old age pension in the United Kingdom and goes to Australia may still receive that pension in Australia, but the amount is much less than the Australian pension of £3 per week, and no supplementation can be made under the Australian law until the expiration of 20 years' residence. The comparative position of a married couple is even worse, because an Australian married couple of pension age receives £6 a week. When Senator Cooper was in England recently he made inquiries of many people as to the reasons for the inadequate number of English people who had migrated to Australia and he found that this lack of reciprocal arrangements in social services was a material factor. In addition to age pensions, reciprocity with the United Kingdom is needed in respect of widows' and invalid pensions.

(Mr. John Moss, C.B.E., a barrister who has had considerable experience of the British social services, recently returned from an extensive tour of Australia.)

WHAT WORKERS' EDUCATION NEEDS

BY G. D. H. COLE

SPARE-TIME education of grown-up men and women is meant, not to advance them in trade or profession, but to help them to get more out of life. This definition is wide enough to include the pursuit of purely individual culture as an end in itself and also to cover such social motives as the better understanding of the modern world and its problems, with a view to individual or collective action. In practice, what is called the adult education movement extends over both these areas of appeal. Individuals who attend adult classes often find it difficult to explain their own motives for doing so, and, where they find it hard, no one else can expect to find it easy. Motives are in fact very often mixed, and may change as a result of the experience of study. A man or woman may enter a class in order to get a better equipment for citizenship or for activity in some special field, and may then get captivated by the intrinsic fascination of the subject studied, even to the extent of forgetting all about the original purpose. Or, on the other hand, a man or woman may join mainly in quest of personal culture, and then acquire through the contacts thus made a feeling of civic responsibility which was hardly present at the outset as a conscious motive. Nor must it be forgotten that the motives for joining a class have quite often a considerable social element. People join in order to meet and talk with other people, as a relief from loneliness or want of intellectual stimulus. They may also join because their best friend has joined, or because a group they belong to has helped to form the nucleus of a class. Or they may join, especially where new ground is being broken, in the hope of inducing others to follow their example, rather than for what they expect to get out of the class for themselves. But in the type of class of which I am thinking very few will have joined in hope of personal advancement, or because they have been told to do so by someone in authority over them. The adult education class is essentially a voluntary enterprise, in the sense not only that no-one need join it unless he wants to, but also that there is nothing to stop anyone from ceasing to attend as soon as he pleases.

In general the essentially voluntary nature of adult education means that teachers and providing bodies have to set out to give adult students what they want and will in fact enjoy, and not what the teacher or the providing agency thinks they ought to want irrespective of this consideration. But in practice the problem cannot be so simple; for

the teachers and the providing bodies have in mind standards which they set out to maintain, and the latter have also to enlist the interests not only of the actual or potential students but also in many cases of non-educational (or at least not primarily educational) associations and groups to which these students belong. This second consideration applies particularly over the entire range of adult education designed especially for working-class students. Literary and evening institutes and similar centres conducted by local education authorities recruit a high proportion of their students simply as individuals, attracting them by advertisements, announcements, and public meetings to classes in particular subjects chosen in advance. When the institute is a going concern, it often attracts a body of 'regulars' who attend one class after another from year to year and acquire a sort of corporate existence and loyalty to the centre. But to a large extent students in L.E.A. classes get to know one another only in the class and have no bond of union other than their common interest in the subject. As against this, the voluntary bodies active in adult education often draw their students from groups which have already a common interest through membership of bodies not primarily educational—such as trade unions or co-operative societies or guilds, or churches or chapels, or sometimes factories or large offices or groups of neighbours living together on housing estates. Where recruitment is of this kind, very often it is a question not of announcing a subject first and then enrolling those who wish to study it, but of enrolling first a group of potential students and then finding out what subject comes nearest to meeting the desires of a number of persons who do not all want to study the same thing, but can be induced to modify their several preferences in order to get the class going.

This difference is of the greatest importance. The tendency of a good many public bodies, not only in planning their own courses, but also in giving financial and other help to voluntary agencies, is to press for clear advance definition of subjects of study and to object to overlapping between courses planned by different bodies in the same area. This is natural enough with their own direct provision in institutes in which a large number of different courses are being simultaneously carried on; but it simply will not work either when students are being recruited largely through non-educational bodies, such as trade unions, or in small places where there cannot be more than one or two classes, so that the potential students have to take what can be made available or go without. Such students come to a class not because they want to learn a particular subject, but rather because they want generally to widen their knowledge and to improve their sense of mastery of world problems and of the problems of their own society, to learn to think more logically and objectively and to express themselves better and more clearly, and to do these things in company with a group broadly like-minded with themselves and

with a similar background of experience. For such students, the precise subject matters much less than the way it is taught, and much less than the composition of the student-group. The impulse which brings a group into being is fully as much social as instructional, and the methods of both recruitment and teaching need to be adjusted to this overriding condition. This was fully recognized in the formation of the Workers' Educational Association half a century ago and in the collaboration between the W.E.A., the universities, and the working-class movement which grew out of the famous conference on 'Oxford and Working-class Education' and became embodied in the institution of the three-year tutorial class. In the early days the greatest stress was laid on the need for choice of both subject and tutor to rest with the class—which involved the assumption that the class existed before either was chosen. This assumption was, in effect, that there existed bodies of students, recruited mainly from the various branches of the working-class movement, and that the business of the providing agencies was to respond and to adapt their methods to this demand. In practice, as the movement developed, this conception had to be modified; it had to be recognized that the demand could not come into existence of itself on any large scale and that it had to be stimulated by the efforts of the W.E.A. and of its affiliated societies. This, however, did not do away with the recognition of the vital importance of starting with a group rather than with a tutor and a subject ready-made, and of working out the subject of study with the group and giving it choice of tutor as well as of subject.

Gradually, however, as the movement grew larger, and particularly as it developed a wide range of work at levels less advanced than those of the three-year tutorial classes, these elements of democratic choice came to be less and less emphasized. In shorter courses, it was often simply not practicable to create the group first and then let it decide what to study; the best that could be done was to treat the local W.E.A. branch as the representative of the student-body, and to let the branch decide which courses should be offered and who should be invited to teach them. This has worked and still works well where there is a strong and intelligent W.E.A. branch closely in touch with the local working-class movement, but it cannot work where there is no W.E.A. branch, or only a weak one, or where the links between the branch and the local working-class body are inadequate. In such cases, the planning of subjects and the choice of tutors lapses more and more into the hands of the organizing agency, which may be either the W.E.A. district, covering a wide area, or, where the district is weak, the university extra-mural department. Under such conditions choice of subject and tutor, and the democratic self-government of the classes, easily become mere shams, with no real content. Instead of a democratic demand springing from the working-class movement or from any representative source, one gets a movement organized

from above and offering the students what is supposed to be good for them, rather than what responds to their deeper impulses and excites their loyalty and enthusiasm.

It is, no doubt, easy to argue that these developments are the unavoidable consequences of the movement's emergence from its pioneer phase, and that no adult education movement on a scale such as now exists could have been brought into being by the old methods. This latter statement may or may not be true; but I am sure that the adult education movement of to-day, taken as a whole, is much less than it used to be a response to real demands and much more an artificial creation from the side of supply. Of course, the supplying bodies have still to provide what students will voluntarily accept, and have no power to force any sort of education down anyone's throat—for those who do not like what they are offered can always go away. Nevertheless, responding to a demand is something essentially different from offering something which potential students can take or leave, and it is, I believe, a fundamental weakness of a large part of adult education to-day that it is doing the second of these things rather than the first. The movement is following, no doubt, both the easier course and that which has much the stronger appeal to the administrative mind. The alternative method, which the original promoters of the movement regarded as right and indispensable, cannot be followed unless there exists as a basis for it a really vigorous local workers' educational organization in close and continuous contact with the life of the local community and with the local working-class movements in particular. In areas where this condition is satisfied, as I think it broadly is in such an area as North Staffordshire, with its long W.E.A. tradition, the entire life of the adult education movement has a different character from that which it takes on where it consists mainly of a number of classes organized from a remote district or university centre.

For this reason, any arrangement which tends to transfer responsibility and organizing activity from the W.E.A. to the university extra-mural department or to some institute conducted by a local education authority ought to be resisted as tending to undermine the democratic character of the movement. Over and above this, resistance should be offered within the W.E.A. to anything that tends to reduce the importance and responsibility of the branch and to concentrate power and activity in the district office—except where the district itself is small and compact. It has to be recognized that both these tendencies are very strong, and that resistance to them can be effective only if the W.E.A. itself is sufficiently vigorous. This points to the necessity for giving very careful consideration to the work of W.E.A. branches and to the means of making them more effective in the conditions of the present day. In proportion as the W.E.A. fails to carry out its original purpose, of acting as the point of focus for the interest of the working-class movement and of its members in adult edu-

cation and of representing a specifically working-class demand, the quality of its activity is bound to degenerate in its local work and the kind of demand it was set up primarily to meet tends to go unsatisfied. The mere multiplication of classes is of no value in itself; unless they have distinctive character and purpose they can just as well be left to the L.E.A. or to other agencies that do not profess to have any special working-class connections. How, then, can this distinctive character of W.E.A. work be preserved and, where it has been lost, restored?

There is no single answer to this question, but there are certain most important contributory answers. In the first place, the branch must not be a mere agency for arranging classes; it must have a real life of its own extending to many who are not class-members. It must be in close touch with the local trade union and co-operative bodies, arranging Saturday schools, week-end schools, and lectures on subjects of current interest to appeal to their members, sending speakers to address them, and participating actively in occasions which they arrange among themselves. But the local W.E.A. branch cannot in fact do these things unless it is organized for doing them. In especial, there are two indispensable conditions: tutors in local classes must be active branch members, ready to take on jobs for the branch and by no means deeming their work done when they have conducted their classes well; secondly tutors and classes must regard it as an integral part of their work to produce active participants in the life of the branch, speakers who can be sent to talk to local meetings or groups, and spare-time tutors who can conduct elementary classes within the local working-class movement. At any rate no tutorial class should be considered to have done its job until it has produced several voluntary tutors and speakers from its own ranks.

One of the movement's curses is that, as the work of university extramural departments has become more highly organized, there has been in many areas an increasing tendency to regard the tutor simply as a tutor—a professional who ought not to be called on to spend his time going round doing odd jobs. In reality, in working-class education, these odd jobs are of the very essence of the work to be done, both because they need doing in order to maintain the movement's democratic character and because they teach the tutor how to conduct his classes in the required spirit, and not merely with academic competence. A second curse is that, with the extension of grants of public money to less advanced courses and with the invasion by some universities of the more elementary fields of adult education, there has come a growing expectation of being paid for everything, whereas in a healthy movement a large part of the short-course work ought to be done without any payment at all. This will not happen unless the local branch life is energetic and comradely, as on the whole it was when the movement was young and both students and tutors

go from it a sense of mission.

So far I have been considering the general work of the workers' education movement, primarily in connection with local classes and other local activities centring round the branch. There are, however, a number of newer factors of which in any survey of problems and prospects it is necessary to make mention. One of these is the growing tendency for trade unions to take up educational work on their own account, quite apart from such help as they give to the W.E.A. This work is for the most part different in character from what the W.E.A. has been doing, save quite occasionally. The individual trade unions are for the most part concerned in their own educational work neither with providing cultural opportunities for their members nor with increasing their basic understanding of the main forces at work in the contemporary world, but rather with improving the quality of the union's own work in the fields of organization, administration, collective bargaining and joint consultation. Much of the teaching in these fields can clearly be done by officers or members of the union concerned, provided they know how to teach; but there are other parts which need the collaboration of outside bodies, such as technical colleges, on the production and book-keeping and cost-accounting sides, or can be done better by a mingling of 'inside' tutors with tutors who have studied industrial relations or trade union practices over a wider field. There is also the question whether courses intended mainly to promote trade union (or, *mutatis mutandis*) co-operative efficiency would not best achieve their end if they included at any rate some element of wider education—for example, in the general history of the working-class movement.

The lines of collaboration in these fields between the trade unions and outside bodies specifically concerned with workers' education can only be laid down after a good deal of diverse experiment. The larger unions will necessarily wish to keep the control of this kind of specialized education mainly in their own hands; the smaller will not be in a position to provide without joint action or the use of outside agencies. The Trades Union Congress, which has already undertaken some work of this type, may extend its activities to meet the need; or the W.E.A. may be called in to give increasing help. Whatever the bodies undertaking the new tasks, it will be necessary to discover in time a new supply of tutors qualified to do what is wanted.

Some trade unionists, I know, deny the value of this kind of work, and hold that the only sound way of making trade union officers and representatives better at their jobs is for them to learn by trial and error. At the other extreme there are a few who, largely influenced by American examples, are disposed to subordinate all other forms of workers' education to this purely vocational kind. Both these views are misguided. Trial and error are no longer a sufficient preparation for the tasks which

fall upon trade unionism as its power increases, but equally it would be disastrous to abandon the wider kinds of workers' education in order to concentrate wholly on the training for trade union service. Trade union withdrawal from the wider field would undermine the position of the workers' educational bodies and would hand over adult workers' education to agencies which would lack all appreciation of the special needs of students whose motives in joining classes are social rather than exclusively cultural. A balance will need to be struck between the two kinds of workers' education, but it seems likely that the work of the W.E.A. will continue to be mainly in the field of general education, as against that of specialized preparation for trade union (or co-operative) service.

How wide is this field? I have said already that I am unimpressed by the mere numbers of classes that the W.E.A., or any other body, contrives to run, especially when quite a proportion of the classes it does run have no particular connection with workers' education in any definite sense of the term. I would sooner see fewer classes related to the needs of the working-class movement. Difficult though contraction may be, I am inclined to believe that it will need to happen if the movement is to do the job it once set out to do. The problem, however, differs in large towns on the one hand and in small towns and country districts on the other. In the large towns there is room for a workers' educational movement to exist side by side with adult education movements not directed specifically to working-class students; in small towns or rural areas there is often no practical possibility of more than one movement doing good work. It is therefore necessary to accept as unavoidable the tendency for village and small-town classes to cast their net wider in terms of social groups than large-town classes, and for W.E.A. branches in such areas to be more in the nature of general providers of adult education than specific providers for working-class students. In the big towns, on the other hand, I believe the W.E.A. would be wise to hold aloof as far as possible from sponsoring classes which have no real connection with the working-class movement and consist mainly of students who can be described as 'working-class' only in the broadest possible sense of the term. This would involve actually encouraging such groups to conduct their activities under other auspices, and would, I am well aware, give rise to difficulties with a good many local education authorities and with some university extra-mural departments. But these difficulties would be well worth facing if the rejected groups could be replaced by groups arising out of improved contacts with the local working-class bodies, and if, as a result of the change in emphasis, these bodies could be induced to look upon the W.E.A. more as their own and to accept more responsibility for promoting its success. In effect, the W.E.A. cannot have it both ways. It cannot be a general adult education provider and at the same time the educational representative of the working-class movement. If it attempts to be the

ter, it will antagonize some of its supporters and perhaps have to do battle for some of the public money it gets. But if it is content to be the former, it can have no sufficient reason for expecting the working-class movement to give it any substantial backing, and it will be in constant danger of losing its independence, which rests in the last resort on the esteem accorded to it among the local stalwarts of the trade union, co-operative and political Labour movement.

It should be understood that I am not at all urging the W.E.A. to abandon or to modify its attitude of objectivity in teaching or its refusal to adopt a party-political or sectarian standpoint. It must continue as strongly as ever to practise these principles, and to leave to other agencies those forms of educational work which presuppose the rightness of a particular economic, political, or religious creed. It must do this in the interest of the working-class movement itself, on the ground that the movement needs this kind of objective education and cannot hope to develop the right kinds of leadership and mental alertness without it. In a totalitarian society, it is no doubt unavoidable that all education must rest on a basis of dogma. In a working-class movement animated by totalitarian objectives, the same thing is bound to happen to workers' education. But Great Britain neither is nor shows any signs of becoming a totalitarian society, and the British working-class movement is not a movement with totalitarian tendencies. It does not start out from the assumption that there is necessarily but one correct answer to any question and that this answer can be determined by the authoritarian methods of 'democratic centralism'. It does not hold that truth is relative to class-attitude, or must be pursued exclusively within the limits of a particular class-standpoint. It does not believe that because Britain is still a capitalist country, there can be in it nothing that is good or worth preserving. It does believe broadly in the real value of certain traditions and cultural qualities of British society, and wishes to help in their diffusion and in the carrying of them over intact into the new society that lies ahead of us. In fact, even those who are readiest to deny this act on it much of the time.

As the British working class and the movements it has created to express its needs are not totalitarian, but are strongly libertarian, they need educational agencies fitted to work in the spirit of their own beliefs. But they also require these agencies to be their own—not paternalistic gifts from the Government or the more highly educated classes—and to be carried on democratically with their effective participation and for the purposes they regard as important. To bring back the W.E.A. to a fuller acceptance of this service is, I feel sure, the outstanding task of the leaders of the workers' educational movement at the present time. I do not suggest that, if this can be achieved, there is likely to be either a great rush of worker-students into W.E.A. classes or a stampede of trade unions to offer their help. I do not believe that there are large numbers of trade union-

ists or co-operators who are pining secretly for classes which will make them both better trade unionists or co-operators and better citizens of democratic society. The numbers of such potential recruits depend in practice on the degree of enthusiasm that exists for the trade union, co-operative and Labour movements among their members, and also on the extent to which these movements provide encouragement and opportunity to their members to play an active and formative part in their affairs. The more centralized the great working-class bodies become, the fewer among their members are likely to be aroused to the sense of a need to make themselves either better trade unionists or co-operators, or better citizens, or better men and women. I am fully alive to the fact that the weaknesses of the workers' education movement, as it exists to-day, proceed largely from weaknesses in the wider movements on which they depend for support and driving-force. The educational wing cannot in practice advance far ahead of the other wings.

That does not mean, however, that it need lag behind, or commit suicide by allowing itself to become merged in the general movement of adult education. It can rely on the support of the working-class movement only if it shows itself ready to stand up for that movement's claims, special needs, and sense of solidarity and loyalty. These claims need standing up for all the time, not so much against 'class-economics' or against conscious reactionaries as against administrators in quest of tidiness and largely unaware of the special conditions needed for success in working-class education, and against university and other academic persons who have been used to teaching pupils who cannot run away from them and are kept further in subordination by the need to pass certain examinations in order to qualify for jobs. The more internal teachers in universities see of and participate in workers' education, the fewer mistakes they are likely to make. The same remedy cannot be used to cure the diseases of administrators and local education committees, although those of the latter can be alleviated by getting more adult students elected to them. It is too much to hope that the administratively-minded or committeemen who regard the whole working-class movement with hostility will come to love the W.E.A. the better, the more they know of it; for voluntary workers' education is bound to affront the bureaucrat by its untidiness and the reactionary by the very fact that it sets out to serve the workers' movement. But, where love cannot be won, respect is often a good substitute. The more closely the workers' educational movement can link itself to the wider workers' movement and so gain its positive support, the more—provided it sticks to its educational principles—will it be respected even where it is not loved. And in addition the more it will be loved by those whose love is best worth having—the active workers who become its students and the teachers who, out of a sense of mission, devote the best part of their lives to its service.

REVIEWS AND REVIEWERS

BY MAX BELOFF

As to the Edinburgh Reviewers, it would indeed require an Hercules to crush the Hydra; but if the author succeeds in merely "bruising one of the heads of the serpent," though his own hands should suffer in the encounter, he will be amply satisfied.—BYRON.

WE live in an age of more delicate regard for the susceptibilities of others and the chance of an English bard being slain by a Scottish reviewer is a remote professional risk. The trouble is that as reviewers have got more gentle, writers have become thinner-skinned, and some eminent persons at least would not nowadays subscribe to Lord Byron's confident assertion: "An author's works are public property: he who purchases may judge, and publish his opinion if he pleases." As a result of this and other changes in the intellectual climate, reviewing at the moment suffers among other things from an excess of timidity; and genuine controversy is all too rare. To expose error was once a way to professional and academic preferment; it is now all too likely to be the reverse. It is not that there are "sacred cows", but that all cows are sacred—particularly those whose udders have long been dry.

The poet and the novelist must decide for themselves whether they like the present situation, or indeed whether these remarks apply as aptly to their quarter of the literary horizon as they do to the treatment of works on history and public affairs which are the proper subject of the present article. But before embarking upon that subject, one caution should be added. Although the fashion of presenting political or social questions in fictional form is on the whole not very prominent at the present time, at least in this country, there are still occasions when a novel raises issues of an importance greater than the fortunes of its fictional personages or the felicities of its treatment. Such a work tends to fare particularly badly under the present system.

To take a recent example, John Connell's *Time and Chance** is not only (if a non-expert may venture such an opinion) a moving and beautifully written novel, but it deals with a great historical transition; the retreat from the British Empire and imperial responsibilities in recent years; the share in that retreat of a political creed in this country that denies and makes mock of the stern virtues upon which the empire was built, and by

* Constable. 15s.

which it is retained, and the moral issue of how far a single generation has the right to throw away the achievement of its ancestors, surrendering to an ill-instructed clamour for "self-government" its responsibility to the helpless for good government. When a novel of this calibre is dismissed by an eminent Sunday newspaper in three anonymous and colourless lines, is it a literary or a political judgment, or merely that falling outside the current major categories of fiction, it found its allotted reviewer with no idea of how to go about reviewing it?

The kind of book that is more obviously a contribution to an understanding of the current scene—a work on history or politics or economics—is unlikely to share this particular fate. But the problems it raises are serious. For one thing, the output of such books is very large whereas the time available for reading them is often very restricted in the case of those to whom they could be most valuable. Therefore the first duty of newspapers and periodicals and of the B.B.C. is to make clear beyond doubt what is and is not worth reading. This is all the more important because while the novelist, or the poet, or the scholar may have difficulty in finding a publisher, in the case of certain contemporary themes, it is all too easy. Whether some publishers grudge the miserable guineas they pay their readers, or whether having paid the guineas they neglect their advice, or whether their readers are incompetent, is not clear; what is clear is that much rubbish finds its way into publication and that publishers on the whole do not get rapped over the knuckles as they deserve but instead are allowed to complain of shortage of paper, bottle-necks in binding and all their other favourite explanations for the slow appearance of better books. In some fields, even reputable firms may err—and trust to kindly editors to protect them.

At the moment it is Russia and things connected with Russia that the public is assumed, perhaps rightly, to be most interested in. The current situation in Asia does indeed render an understanding of the Soviet approach to non-European peoples a vital matter. Yet when some time ago, an extremely ill-informed and superficial work on this subject, which might in the hands of the unscrupulous have done much harm, was produced under a well-known and politically irreproachable imprint, I found my own small endeavour to point out the errors in the work patently frustrated by the editor of a deservedly popular new illustrated monthly, on the familiar plea of lack of space (which did not prevent him sending either myself or other reviewers a great many more books on subjects of less moment).

The opposite fate befell the first volume of Mr. E. H. Carr's *The Bolshevik Revolution*. Here was a work which to anyone seriously conversant with the subject was far and away superior to anything that had so far appeared in the English language on this all-important event. It was to a much greater extent than could be understood by anyone un-

familiar with the considerable technical problems of the accessibility of source material, a pioneer work. It was written with an absence of passion all too rare in books upon this subject, and upon certain premises which were clearly stated. Yet on the whole most reviewers failed to fulfil even the primary duty of making clear the contents of the book, the author's terms of reference, and the importance of his contribution to Soviet studies generally. Some reviewers disliked Mr. Carr and his views—on other questions—some disliked the Soviet Union: some liked Mensheviks not Bolsheviks; some left-wing socialists paradoxically discovered that Mr. Carr had outraged a vein of native liberalism in themselves which their best friends had never suspected to exist. *The Times Literary Supplement* made good its claim to be the doyen of the literary world by behaving like the rest, only more so.

Although political and personal prejudices are often allowed to obliterate the proper function of a reviewer, where a genuine political issue does arise over a book, there are considerable chances that it will not get ventilated at all, or only partially. When for instance the publishers of "Penguins" decided to publish a history of the U.S.S.R. and commissioned for the purpose a well-known communist who produced as might be expected a work in strict accordance with the "party line" and containing therefore wholly unjustifiable insinuations about Great Britain, it was considered the height of bad form, a sort of British "McCarthyism" to suggest that the thousands of "Penguin" readers might reasonably have been warned that the "history" they were being offered was history of a very special kind. Even more ungentlemanly was thought to be the conduct of those who suggested that a life of Lenin written some years earlier by an eminent fellow of an Oxford college was for similar reasons hardly the product of impartial scholarship.

Of course, neither reviewing nor writing can on such matters be strictly neutral. No doubt patriotism is as much a prejudice as anti-patriotism. It is as wrong to assume that Britain has always been in the right, as to take the common *New Statesman* line that it is always in the wrong. One will not go to reviews in the *New Statesman* or the *Tribune* for impartiality about a political book; though in the former there are often excellent reviews of historical works.

On the other hand, if one is going to have to discount something in order to evaluate the utility of a review, one must know what it is one is discounting. For this reason, anonymity in reviewing (whatever one's views about it are in general journalism) is an outmoded fashion clung to by certain journals—*The Times Literary Supplement*, *The Economist* and *The Listener*—for professed reasons that will not stand examination, at least where historical or political writings in the broadest sense are concerned.

Anonymity in reviewing is an attempt to support with the prestige of an

institution what can only be an individual opinion. If I were to review a treatise on Sanskrit in the *Literary Supplement* my total ignorance of the language would not be palliated by the distinction of the company in which I appeared, or the tradition I inherited; yet the review would be treated with a respect that it would hardly receive if published over my own name in *The Spectator*, or in *Time and Tide*. The defence given in *The Times* article on the fiftieth anniversary of the *Supplement*, was possibly relevant in some fields of pure literature: "Its anonymity has been designed not to lay down the law but to give consistent authority to a wide range of suggestion." But while a neglected talent in poetry or fiction may have another chance quite soon, and while mere suggestion as to merit and demerit is a possible attitude to writings of this kind, the information one wants about other kinds of books is much more precise. Is the book important or not? Is it correct or not in its main contentions? And the reader's confidence cannot be given to anonymity unless he has the fullest confidence that the selection of a reviewer for each book is made, with absolute disregard for all considerations but the matching of reviewer and subject, and that the editor's judgment on this point is infallible. Few readers in a sophisticated age are prepared to accept this view, and experience shows that they would be wrong if they did.

Of course things may be partially saved by a properly run correspondence column. When the *Supplement* gives high praise to a work on the *Gunpowder Plot* which reverts to theories long-exploded by scholars, there is always Mr. Hugh Trevor-Roper to rush in to the rescue. But Mr. Trevor-Roper's love of the truth, energy and indifference to the perils of controversy is all too rare; there are not enough Trevor-Ropers. It would be simpler to know one's reviewer.

Furthermore, there is the fact that it is vital to know whether the amount of space devoted to a book is some indication of its importance, or whether it is an index rather to the importance of the reviewer. If one knew the reviewer's name one would be a little nearer perhaps to knowing the answer. Of course there are perils in personality-mongering in reviewing, as in any other types of journalism. The worst of them is the habit of allotting regular space to some prominent personality and letting the choice of the books to be featured depend upon his personal preferences. With the catastrophic fall in the amount of space for reviews in the Sunday papers, for instance, this may largely distort the whole picture of the literary scene. Review sections of journals run on this principle, resemble provincial theatre companies where the choice of repertoire is limited by the necessity of giving important parts to leading players of an age or girth that makes some parts more suitable than others. But there is no reason to believe, as the anonymity snobs tell one, that there is no middle course. The regular use of unobtrusive but recognizable initials as in the *Oxford Magazine*—the best journal for reviews in the country—

is one possible alternative. There may be others; the great thing is to dispel the illusion that anonymous reviews are any more desirable than anonymous books—or anonymous letters!

On this particular aspect of the matter, the B.B.C. at least is guiltless. But as I have suggested in an article in the Spring number of the *B.B.C. Quarterly* to which I may perhaps be allowed to refer, the B.B.C. and in particular the Third Programme has still not solved the problem of the meeting of the spoken and the written word. In particular, the real chance of controversy, of having a book discussed by two critics with rival prejudices, or by a hostile critic and the author himself has been fantastically neglected. *The Struggle for Europe* is a good enough book to stand on its own merits; but Mr. Chester Wilmot's distinguished services to the B.B.C. were probably of some use in getting for his book the imaginative and extended treatment on sound and television which few (if any) other authors have had.

On the other hand, the 20 minutes allowed for a straight book-talk on the Third Programme means a larger number of words than a reviewer can normally hope for elsewhere. And since one of the great weaknesses of most reviewing is that the reviews are far too short to deal adequately with important books, there is a considerable advantage in broadcast reviews, even if they tend to find their way into programmes at times when one is either at work, on the way home from work, or asleep. It is a pity that the monthlies on the whole fail to use their space for the long reviews for which neither the dailies, nor the weeklies can find room.

Again the Third Programme partially redeems itself along with the *Literary Supplement* for its attention however intermittent to books published abroad. At least one can say for the *Times Literary Supplement* that it does not share the common illusion that nothing published outside England is worth reading or ever read. Professions of internationalism combined with concrete evidence of insularity form one of the many paradoxes of the present intellectual situation. It is not the least harmful and irritating of them.

We walk on shifting sands most of us; except for the bands of dogmatists who tread along their own narrow planks to perdition. We are assailed on all sides by propaganda, and weakened by uncritical thinking. Our greatest need is to sift, to select, to dispute. Book reviewing could play a part in fulfilling this need; as at present organized in this country it does so only imperfectly. Some part of the blame is probably outside anyone's control—paper-shortage for instance—but part of it rests perhaps, on the erroneous attitudes of editors and reviewers. It would be interesting to discover how widely this view is held.

(Mr. Max Beloff is Reader in the Comparative Study of Institutions in Oxford University and a Professorial Fellow of Nuffield College.)

THE THUNDERER'S AUTOBIOGRAPHY

By H. G. NICHOLAS

NO institution in modern Britain has been so neglected by historians as the press. For the past 150 years the newspaper has been one of the great moulding influences of our society, insistent, pervasive, and ubiquitous. Yet the majority of modern historians have ignored it, and the rest have handled it with a diffidence and clumsiness that stand in striking contrast to the assurance with which they write of Parliament, diplomacy or the bank rate. Why is this? Some, no doubt, are inhibited by academicism. Brought up to believe that there is something called scholarship and something else called journalism, they have felt fear and distaste at the thought of crossing the frontier that divides them, in abandoning the manuscript and the 'unpublished sources' for newsprint and mass publication. Others, emancipated from such inhibitions, may yet be hampered by technical incompetence; never having been inside a newspaper office, they cannot assess and interpret even the public face of journalism, much less what lies behind. Besides, what lies behind has, so far, been singularly impenetrable. The press which lives by publicity is not anxious itself to be publicized—except, that is, on its own terms. Consequently revelations from within have been few and investigations organized from without have been unrewarding. The worthwhile books on the history of the British press in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries would not fill a five-foot shelf.

On that shelf, however, a good ten inches must now be reserved for the four volume history of *The Times*,* the first worthy history of a major British newspaper. It is significant that it is the work not of an academic historian, but of a typographer-journalist. It is probably also significant that it should be *The Times* which is the pioneer in such autobiography. More than any other paper, it thinks (and writes) of to-day with an awareness of tomorrow leaning over its shoulder and yesterday looming in the background. More than any other paper, it conceives of itself as an institution and so has preserved a continuity, a tradition and, above all, records, which assist a historian who is searching for the significant threads in the maze of a newspaper's ephemera. On the other hand no organ in Fleet Street has been more jealous of its secrets, more concerned to lock in its cupboards skeletons and trophies alike. To allow this crib

* *The History of The Times*, Vol. IV, 1912-1948: In two parts bound separately. *The Times*. 50s.

to be cracked, even by one of its own locksmiths, must have called for an effort of will, a sustained exercise of nerve that ran against all the instincts and the training of Printing House Square. That the enterprise, once begun, should adhere consistently to what the author calls the "course of resolute self-examination" is remarkable enough. But at the same time it is no more than the character of Mr. Stanley Morison and *The Times* itself would lead one to expect. What is most remarkable is first that the work should have been undertaken at all on so ample a scale, and secondly that it should have been brought down so nearly to current times. For the courage of these decisions no praise can be too high; the honesty of purpose with which they have been executed has few parallels in contemporary historical writing.

To all the difficulties that press history presents, contemporary press history adds one more. It must describe a newspaper in the context of events which are not yet established, on which Clio, through her chosen agency of the historical text books, has not yet imprinted her tidy pattern. The fourth volume of *The Times* narrative deals with the years 1912 to 1939—the period of the great *lacuna*, too recent to have been written up, too distant to be remembered. Consequently the author has the double burden of having both to narrate the events themselves and of describing *The Times'* reaction to them and its rôle in shaping them. This burden was already intermittently apparent in Vol. III. In Vol. IV it is so heavy that it has literally burst the bounds of manageability and has resulted in the splitting of the book into two physically distinct volumes, as well as the spilling over of large quantities of material into appendices and notes. No one who has any experience at all of organizing this type of material will be harshly critical of an author faced with such difficulties, yet it must be admitted that the craftsmanship of this elaborate marquetry is not always up to the quality of the timber that composes it. There are inelegancies, corrigenda (over and above those listed), occasional omissions and repetitions; worse still there are certain obscurities in the narrative which are not always excused by the complexity of the subject matter. The style, while generally as simple and direct as a good journalist's, lapses occasionally into an oracular obliquity which suggests that the burden of revelation is almost more than *The Times'* flesh and blood can stand.

However the narrative takes wings and soars into an absolute mastery of its subject whenever the inner politics of Printing House Square are the theme. The Northcliffe story is superlatively told. His feline malice is depicted with the *petit-point* fidelity of an Ivy Compton-Burnett; his sledge-hammer megalomania comes across with a Graham Greene-like realism. Yet justice is not sacrificed to effect. When Northcliffe's long-overdue biography comes to be written, the 'Northoleon' of English journalism can hope for no fairer treatment. That he was the salvation

of *The Times* is as fully recognized as the more obvious fact that, save for the accident of death, he would have been its ruin. His story is lifted indeed to the truly tragic place on which it properly belongs. Here is no Hearst or Rothermere consumed with a merely vulgar lust for power. They are the Richelieus of the press; Northcliffe, by comparison, is almost a Father Joseph, subverting to his own purposes the faith to which with one part of him he is genuinely devoted, corrupting the very institution which he has sacrificed so much to preserve. His is the double failure of not being able to woo *The Times* round to a willing acquiescence in his demands and then, when his crude powers as proprietor are about to be substituted for his subtle wiles as a journalist, of seeing paranoia and death snatch his prize away in the very moment of victory.

The irony of *The Times* owing its salvation to its arch-enemy is paralleled inversely by the irony of its devoted servants becoming the agents of its disgrace. The *History* does not dwell upon the paradox that the lowest point of *Times*' leadership should be reached under an editor so determined to safeguard the liberal ideal of editorial integrity and independence that he extracted from John Walter and John Jacob Astor what no previous editor had ever received from the proprietors, a written charter of editorial rights and liberties. Geoffrey Dawson used this, with all sincerity of purpose, to advocate a course which, it is safe to say, no Northcliffe would have tolerated and which the present *History*, in its frankness, makes little attempt to excuse. So much indeed was pretty generally known already. What was not so generally appreciated, and what the *History* now brings out with striking clarity, is the further irony that the principal executant, if not the responsible designer of *The Times*' 'appeasement' policy was Barrington-Ward, whose succession to Geoffrey Dawson's editorial chair was so widely hailed as initiating a new policy of 'progressivism', almost of radicalism. "Knowledge of good bought dear by knowing ill"—the Miltonic apothegm might well serve as this fourth volume's epigraph.

All this, as I have said, is superbly told. Even where its telling involves judgments on living individuals—as it often does—the full story is not shirked. There must be many passages in these 1,100 pages which many of the actors concerned would prefer not to have seen the cold light of print or, if displayed, to have been softened in their wording. Occasionally, for reasons not explained, the narrative stops short of full explicitness. How dearly the connoisseur of strange encounters would like to know what passed when Sir Basil Zaharoff called on Sir Campbell Stuart in 1922 to negotiate the purchase of *The Times*! But far more frequent are the occasions when the reader feels himself almost to be an invisible eavesdropper, over-hearing secrets that history's microphone seldom picks up—the editorial conference at which Northcliffe's 'stink bomb' was exploded under the noses of the 'troglodytes' of Printing

House Square, or the lunch that hatched the idea of *The Times* board of governors, or the precise circumstances in which Geoffrey Dawson on September 6, 1938, just back from a country week-end and a late dinner, inserted the notorious passages in *The Times* leader that paved the way for the disruption of Czechoslovakia. The intimacy which such glimpses afford invests the narrative at points with the excitement and human interest of a novel—the adventures of Soames Forsyte perhaps, in a setting as melodramatic as anything in Dickens, as bizarre as anything in Balzac, as vulgar as Arnold Bennett's *Card*, and as subtly demoralizing as George Eliot's *Middlemarch*.

Though the 'back room' history of Printing House Square has this particular fascination and may properly claim to be the central theme of any history of *The Times*, it is, fundamentally, less important than the paper itself, what it said and what it did. To write this history, the public history so to speak of the newspaper, also presents difficulties—differences in kind indeed but hardly less considerable in degree. There are two questions the reader wants to have answered—what did the paper say on the great issues of the day and what influence did it have? The fourth volume finds the first question often an intractable one for the reasons mentioned at the outset. The author's balance of interest also gives the treatment a surprising tilt upon occasion. Foreign affairs, admittedly, were the dominant theme of the 'twenties and 'thirties and, amongst them, Anglo-European relations in particular. Yet it is strange to find so much of the Anglo-American story unexplored; there is virtually nothing after 1923 although in the person of Wilmott Lewis the paper had the services of one of the most brilliant (if also sometimes erratic) correspondents in its history.* Domestic affairs proper are even more capriciously treated. The General Strike is passed over in virtual silence, the 1931 crisis is skimped, the long, sad story of economic decline throughout the miserable years of 'tranquillity' is almost ignored. True the abdication crisis is given full—and illuminating—treatment, but domestic politics proper is virtually ignored once the coalition government has been ousted in 1923.

Of all these gaps it might be said that the energetic historian, at any rate, can find the answer himself if only he goes to the labour of digging up the files. When it comes to estimating *The Times*' influence, that is a harder matter. And here indeed the paper's official historian enjoys few advantages denied to the rest of us. 'Influence' is a hard quality to assess at any time, but the influence of a newspaper is often peculiarly elusive. How many votes did *The Times* win for Labour in 1945, or for the Conservatives in 1951? It is a false wisdom that pretends to know the answer. Sometimes, as when a correspondent or an editor acts as a go-between—for example, Smalley in Washington in 1896 over the

* One also wonders why the heroic services of Norman Ebbutt in Berlin are so sketchily described and the correspondent himself left unidentified.

Venezuelan controversy, or Steed over Ireland in 1921—the figure of the press can be detected in the act of jogging Clio's elbow. All such occasions are faithfully recorded in the *History*. But they are relatively infrequent and, when they occur, can reasonably be regarded as arising extra-ordinarily, not out of the run of a newspaper's work—indeed even on one view of journalism, out of a perversion of its proper functions. When one asks what influence *The Times* had, as a newspaper, through its news columns and its leading articles, the answers returned by the *History* are of uneven value. Is one really to believe, what the *History* seems to imply, that Bouchier, as the Balkan correspondent in 1915, might have added "a million bayonets" to the Allied cause? And is there any real evidence for the implication that *Times* leaders in January 1918 really modified the views of Wilson and Lloyd George on the nature of the peace settlement? The *History* is modest enough when it admits that *The Times*' influence on the actual Versailles negotiations was slight, but the assumption that underlies the bulk of the book's treatment of foreign affairs is that *The Times* was a kind of deuterio-Foreign Office, whose views and information were important almost *per se*. The private reports that foreign correspondents send in to Printing House Square assume, rather too often, the significance of the despatches of an ambassador; one reads on, bemused and half-forgetful that these interesting communications are of importance only in so far as they affect what actually appeared in the columns of the paper.

There is, moreover, a certain amount of fuzziness about the *History*'s estimate of *The Times*' constituency. Like a dissolving image in a film, this changes insensibly from the Common Room at All Souls into the Cabinet Room at Number Ten, or 'the Clubs' in Pall Mall, or simply into right-thinking persons everywhere. It is all too readily assumed that it is the equivalent of public opinion, or even 'informed' public opinion, in general—an assumption particularly misleading in the 'twenties and 'thirties, when Dawson is repeatedly described as "following public opinion". An appendix which simply gave *The Times* distribution figures, showing how the percentage of readers in say, Surrey compared with that in Lancashire, or how they divide in terms of income and occupation, would cast more light on *Times* policy than a great deal of editorial analysis.

Perhaps it is this same political portentousness that leads the *History* to pass so lightly over all the other topics of the period. Religion, business, labour (after 1914), art, morals, science—hardly anything is said about these, though the influence of a great newspaper in some of these fields is surely as great as in politics and foreign affairs. Again, the paper's format—a matter which so enormously affects what John Walter III so anxiously described as the paper's "tone"—surely a typographer-historian might legitimately have indulged himself in fuller analysis and

depiction of that. How much of the death-like 'tranquillity' of British opinion in the 'thirties is attributable to the cushioning wording of *Times*' headlines and the sedative arrangement of the centre-page spread?

Listing these omissions is not merely a complaint; it is also a testimony to the appetite and curiosity that these already bulging volumes arouse. *The Times* is an enormously interesting subject; the triumph of the *History* is that it makes it more interesting than ever. These volumes combine elements rarely found together—human interests and institutional analysis, a wealth of factual detail (as to what the paper said) with an undiminished scope for speculation (as to why it said it and with what results). The writing blends the fascination of a highly individual authorship, whose personality shoots tantalizing shafts across the story, with an objectivity and fairness almost unique in works of this kind. Though this volume, regrettably, falls considerably below its predecessors in accuracy, orderliness and finish, it excels them all in courage, interest and vitality. It is equally valuable and equally stimulating to both the historian and the journalist. How long shall we have to wait before the rest of Fleet Street accepts the challenge that its frankness and fullness throw down?

(The author is a Fellow of New College, Oxford.)

IN THE WATER

Weeds are the shape of water: water grows
Like green unplaited hair of some nymph; draw
Her upwards, shaking pearls from her shoulders
In the suspended smoke of waterfalls,
Her smile a brief rainbow . . . White, soft, she slips
Into the rocks yielding like black water:
Has she quite gone? Far, where she breasted, floats
A dazzling swan . . . as if all else were dark.

GLORIA KOMAI

FOUR CENTURIES OF EDWARD VI SCHOOLS

BY RUPERT MARTIN

A CYNIC has observed that Edward VI gained his reputation as a promoter of learning "because his ministers only half killed it." This refers, of course, to the Dissolution of Chantries Act, which was passed by his father in 1545 but never came into full operation until 1548, when the nine-year-old king was given power to take over all the yet undissolved chantries. It is often difficult to separate the work of the young king from that of his father in the foundation of the so-called Edwardian schools. Edward VI has come to enjoy a nobler fame as a patron of education than he perhaps deserves; even the most obstinate upholder of his claims could hardly suppose that a boy of nine, soon after his accession, could have given a personal impulse to all the many schools which bear his name. It is reasonable to maintain that much of the credit should be given to Somerset and Northumberland, though they kept a good deal more of the spoils than they gave back. The object of the Chantries Act was to suppress Roman Catholic practices, so that the chantries should be "converted to good and godlie uses, as in erecting of grammar schools to the education of youth in virtue and godliness." But although the chantry priests had been endowed to sing masses for the souls of the dead, it should not be forgotten that they almost always kept a school as well. Thus when Edward VI's ministers swept away the chantries, education suffered a severe blow in many corners of Britain where a royal foundation for a local school did not necessarily follow.

In many cases, too, schools which are claimed as foundations of Edward VI only took the place of some older seat of learning. Thus there were many local grammar schools, quite apart from a number which now describe themselves as public schools, up and down England, which first suffered confiscation and were then re-founded, often with some quaint phrase about their endowments being "convertyd to the mayntenance of a scoole master." These schools were usually equipped only with a master and an usher; a staff, such as we know now, was an unheard-of affair. Some of these Edwardian schools still preserve an ancient school-room furnished with a desk and dais at each end where, presumably, the teacher with the louder voice gained the greater share of attention. Some also still cherish statutes which decree that a holiday be declared "if the Master and the Usher be absent on the same day."

The effect on the schools of England of the Reformation, and particu-

arly of Henry VIII, Edward VI, Wolsey, Cranmer and Thomas Cromwell, proved profound. Until the quarrel with Rome education in England had been largely in the hands of the monastic communities, which enforced celibacy on churchmen. This meant that clever boys were educated to a high level of scholarship, promoted rapidly to the chief offices in the Church, and thus condemned to die unmarried. The cultured man could establish no family to be a centre of intellectual life, and could leave behind him no sons to inherit his interest and ability, and widen the circle of his own culture. As long as the clergy were doomed to sterility, and as long as learning was centred on the clergy, progress was bound to be meagre and slow. The reforms of the Tudors widened the impact of education on all walks of life, and the intellectual success of the child of the vicarage and the manse has since become proverbial in British life. Elizabeth I herself was, of course, in her own person one great argument for the success of the Reformation in England. The expansion of English fame in her age was helped by the new impetus given to learning and to education, just as much as by the success of her captains. A Spenser and a Sidney, a Bacon and a Shakespeare, were part of the harvest of the new learning, and have taken their places alongside Drake and Burleigh in the annals of that time.

Dispute as the historians may about the niceties of Royal or Church patronage, and about original dates, the fact remains that a large number of old schools are now celebrating the quatercentenary of their foundation (or re-foundation) in the years just before Edward VI's early death in 1553.

Sherborne School, under the shadow of an abbey built in the warm, golden stone of the west country is an example of one which uses the arms of Edward VI, its founder in 1550, although a school had existed in the town since the days of St. Aldhelm. Sherborne was for a time the capital of Wessex and it is probable that King Alfred, who is known to have lived as a boy in the town, may have begun his life-long devotion to learning at the school. When its quatercentenary was celebrated in 1950 the occasion was honoured by a visit from George VI and his queen. Sherborne and its near neighbour, the King's School at Bruton, share the distinction of being the first two schools to have had boards of governors whose first and only duties were educational. They were to be purely lay corporations, with no other aims, religious or municipal, but charged solely with the proper maintenance of their schools. The title '*Libera Schola Grammaticalis*' is often found at this time: *Libera*, because it was to be free, so far as endowments permitted, and *Grammaticalis*, because it was to be a seat of higher education, *grammatica*.

Another school which claims a far older history than the letters patent which it received from Edward VI in 1552 is Bedford. The traditions of the school go back to pre-Conquest times, and the Benedictine Abbey

in the town, founded in 971, was a notable seat of learning. Here, as in all schools with monastic origins, care must be taken about the 'venerable superstition' that monks were schoolmasters in the usual sense of the term. They certainly taught the internal school for oblates within the monastery grounds, but they did not teach other pupils in the cathedral or grammar school. In the medieval grammar school the scholars were taught by a man in holy orders, but not by a monk. After the dissolution of the monasteries the school at Bedford was handed over to the mayor, bailiffs, burgesses and commonalty of the town; on its re-establishment in the young king it found a princely benefactor in William Harper, a native of Bedford who became Lord Mayor of London and was knighted by Elizabeth I.

The King's School at Bruton in Somerset is another example of the combination of private enterprise and royal patronage. Richard Fitz James, Bishop of London, founded the school in 1519, making provision for the method of teaching "after the gode newe Fourme used in Magdalen College in Oxford or in the Scoole of Powles in London"; it was suppressed when the Bruton Abbey lands were given to the Berkeley family (this is the four-hundred-year-old link which connects Berkeley Square with Bruton Street in London), and then re-founded by Edward VI in 1550.

Shrewsbury School belongs to the vintage of 1552, though some of the manuscripts now in its library are thought to have been in the library of the great Benedictine house at Shrewsbury, a celebrated seat of learning for many centuries. The school received its charter as the result of a petition from the people of the district, who felt the lack of educational opportunities for their children. Shrewsbury became a stronghold of the classics under Butler, Kennedy and Moss. To this day there are few classical scholars who do not derive part of their early training from the pages of Kennedy, that formidable despot who used regularly to expel members of his sixth form for making a false quantity in their verses: "Go back and pack your bag: you are a disgrace to your school, your family and your country." Fortunately the victim was invariably hidden by Mrs. Kennedy until the storm had blown over. Shrewsbury is also typical of some ancient schools which have now exchanged their cramped quarters in a town for an open site near its borders.

Tonbridge School, dating from 1553, is an example of a school which received its letters patent from the king, but was put under the protection of a great City Company, the Skinners, in the same way as Dean Cole put his Pauline foundation under the rule of the Mercers Company. Sir Andrew Judd, who petitioned Edward VI for the establishment of Tonbridge, was a Lord Mayor of London, and also held the curious title of 'Lord Deputy and Mayor of the Staple of Calais.' By his will he made the Skinners Company perpetual trustees and governors of his new

foundation.

There is one famous Edwardian foundation which is no mere development of an earlier one, but owes its origin directly to the king's personal interest in some of the problems which his father's policy had raised. The dissolution of the monasteries had deprived a large number of destitute people of their only means of living, which had formerly been provided from the charity of these great houses. Ridley preached a notable sermon in front of the young king, calling attention to their piteous state. Moved by this, Edward gave his support to the Lord Mayor of London who raised funds for the housing and teaching of the city's poorest children. In the year 1552 Christ's Hospital admitted its first scholars, and has carried on its magnificent work ever since, now in country surroundings. Lamb, Coleridge and Leigh Hunt have all drawn interesting pictures of life in this celebrated school. Lamb's description of it at the end of the eighteenth century is a vivid yet dismal one and shows how much boarding schools have changed in the last century-and-a-half. The sensitive child was there at a time when most schools were brutal places, and Christ's Hospital had constant floggings and cells for solitary confinement. Lamb's cameo of Boyer, the grammar master, ranks among the best things in school literature: "He had two wigs, both pedantic, but of different Omen. The one serene, smiling, fresh-powdered, betokening a mild day. The other an old discoloured, unkempt, angry caxon, denoting frequent and bloody execution. Woe to the school when he made his morning appearance in his passionate wig. No comet expounded surer."

Many of the schools of Edward VI have integrated themselves closely with the life and development of great towns, instead of becoming mainly boarding establishments for pupils from all over the country, as Sherborne and Shrewsbury now are. Schools such as those in Birmingham, Bath, Norwich, Leeds and Southampton fall into this category. Men of world-wide fame have been educated in some of them, but it is perhaps in the strengthening and fortifying of local life that such largely day-schools have made their greatest contribution to the nation's progress.

Other well-known schools which pay homage to King Edward VI as the patron of their re-organization are Bromsgrove, Giggleswick and St. Albans. The last is said to have been founded as far back as 948, but received its charter in 1553. Three further schools of this time—King's School, Macclesfield, King Edward School, Stourbridge, and The Royal Grammar School, High Wycombe—show interesting small variations of title, though they all refer to the common founder.

These schools of the mid-sixteenth century can look back on a glorious past, though there were times (notably the early part of the nineteenth century) when many of them fell into grave decay, both in numbers and reputation. Bruton, for example, fell officially as low as one pupil in 1811, though it is possible that the master had private pupils who were not entered in the records. In that year when the solitary scholar pre-

sented himself for examination the governing body kept their annual audit dinner; such a celebration would not be a very cheerful occasion in these days among governing bodies, most of whom are compelled to keep an anxious eye on numbers, in order to provide revenue for daily needs. At Shrewsbury, too, in 1798 Samuel Butler is said to have found two boarders only in the school on his arrival and wrote: "In my attempt to establish the almost unheard-of principle of discipline I had all the mammas in Shrewsbury against me and for nearly twenty years I struggled on almost without a friend." Many other foundations of Edward VI experienced their nadir at this time, until the Victorian prosperity of the mid-nineteenth century raised their numbers, their funds, their amenities and their prestige.

It is true to say that never have these old schools been more flourishing than they are to-day, but the future is one which must inevitably bring changes, at any rate in the boarding communities. A competent committee has recently estimated that in leading schools of this type some 70 per cent. of parents are paying fees partly out of capital. This is obviously not a state of affairs that can go on for ever. Critics of such schools, who are not always over-friendly to their honourable past, say openly that they are in no hurry to lay violent hands on them, because the inexorable laws of economics will do their work for them just as certainly within a given time. Fair-minded people, who realize how much these old centres of education have contributed to the life of the country and the commonwealth, hope that some reasonable compromise between the intention of a royal founder and the will of a twentieth-century people can still be found. Lately many charges have been levelled against the schools which have survived the centuries as boarding communities. One is that their special claim to inspire leadership is an out-of-date one in an egalitarian democracy, in which the gifted leader is not encouraged to read Whitehall files with the telescope to his blind eye. Another is that the pupils in them pass four or five years in a state of luxury which is unsuitable to their training for a modern world. In actual fact, some of the most famous schools in the land use archaic buildings which would strike terror into the heart of a local education authority, and the boys in them frequently sleep on beds which their fathers, 30 years earlier, had condemned as unfit for further service. In such schools "the tongue of Rome is still taught in the atmosphere of Sparta." The mellow air of a past age clings to many of their buildings, in front of which the founder's statue looks down on a devoted community whose hardy training is still influenced by the standards of Tudor England.

(The author is a former headmaster and a present governor of one of the Edward VI schools.)

THE IDEAL OF *FRATERNITÉ* (1789-1849)—II

BY DAVID THOMSON

THE mood of France in February 1848, when the second great revolution began, was even more optimistic and idealistic than the mood of 1789. This time the ideal of fraternity mattered greatly from the outset, and was an integral part of the whole republican ideal as it had taken shape in opposition to the middle-class monarchy of Louis Philippe.

When the newly proclaimed provisional Government met at the Hôtel de Ville on February 24, 1848, they issued a proclamation to the people. This announced that the democratic government which the people wanted would have as its principle "liberty, equality and fraternity."* In due course, when the Constitution of the Second Republic was drawn up nine months later, its preamble embodied this revolutionary triad for the first time as an official slogan. According to Article 4 the Republic "has as its principle liberty, equality and fraternity. It has as its basis the family, labour, property, public order." And according to Article 8: "The Republic shall protect the citizen in his person, his family, his religion, his property, his work, and shall make available for each the education indispensable for all; it shall, by fraternal help, secure livelihood for its needy citizens, either by providing them with work within the limits of its resources, or by giving assistance to those who are unfit to work and whose families cannot help them." Likewise Article 7 provided that citizens have the duty to "co-operate for the common well-being by mutual fraternal help."† Fraternity became, for the first time, a constitutional obligation both on the citizen and on the State.

Armand Marrast in his report on the Constitution declared that the aim of the Republic was not equality pure and simple, but "equality governed and explained by fraternity." He saw, as the "happy and fruitful novelty of our Republic and of our age Fraternity, serving as the origin of institutions, inspiring the laws, animating the whole State with its spirit." In his circulated comments on the new Constitution, Eugène Sue claimed that "fraternity prevents 1848 from being like 1793."

In his circular of March 5, 1848, on behalf of the provisional Government, Lamartine reserved the right of the Republic to help subject

* See L. Duguit, H. Monnier, R. Bonnard: *Les Constitutions et les principales lois politiques de la France depuis 1789* (5th ed. 1932) p. xciv, footnote 2.

† For full French text, see *ibid.*, pp. 232-4.

peoples, but only in their own interests and only if they wanted such help. It was a greatly modified version of the 'Decree of Fraternity' of 1792. Assuring the French diplomatic agents to whom the circular was addressed that "we wish the world and ourselves to march to brotherhood and peace" he asserted: "Liberty has set all free. Equality before the law has levelled all. Fraternity, whose application we must proclaim and whose benefits the National Assembly must organize, will unite all . . . Reason, spreading everywhere, across the frontiers of nations, has created in men's minds that great intellectual nationality which will be the achievement of the French Revolution, and the constitution of international brotherhood throughout the world . . . The Republic . . . proclaims herself the intellectual and cordial ally of all rights, of all progress, of all legitimate development of the institutions of nations who want to live according to the same principle as herself. She will make no secret or incendiary propaganda among her neighbours. She knows that there are no durable liberties except those that are born of themselves in their own soil."* This 'Manifesto to Europe' was regarded as applying the principle of fraternity to international relations, just as the "organization of labour" urged by Louis Blanc would mark its application to social affairs. Despite the eager Utopianism of 1848, at least the ideal of fraternity had progressed a stage. At last a serious attempt was being made to reduce its implications to concrete political issues and policies, both internally and internationally.

The ideal of fraternity was, indeed, the main watchword of the earliest stages of the revolution of 1848. Universal suffrage was regarded as the strongest political guarantee of universal brotherhood; no citizen should be deprived of a voice in the determination of national policy. But the socialists and more extreme revolutionaries were already demanding a more drastic extension of its implications than moderates like Lamartine were prepared to countenance. And in the conflict between them, history repeated itself and fratricide replaced fraternity in the bloody June Days.

The cult of continuity with the heroic days of 1792, in which the more romantic revolutionaries indulged, soon became foolish. De Tocqueville noted that in the elections to the Constituent Assembly "most of the candidates had resumed the old customs of '92. When writing to people they called themselves "citizens" and signed themselves fraternally yours". He added: "I would never consent to adopt this revolutionary nonsense."† The provisional Government decided to recall 1790 and to organize a 'Festival of Fraternity' in the Champ-de-Mars, wherein figures represented liberty, equality and fraternity walking hand in hand, and where it was hoped that a "fraternal confusion" would happily prevail. Landlords were expected to remit rents, and de Tocqueville

* Quoted in A. de Lamartine: *History of the French Revolution of 1848* (1849 English translation), p. 278 ff.

† *The Recollections of Alexis de Tocqueville* (1948 edition) p. 101.

recorded the delicious advertisement which one of them printed in a newspaper.

Mr. Editor: I make use of your paper to inform my tenants that, desiring to put into practice in my relations with them the principles of fraternity that should guide all true democrats, I will hand to those of my tenants who apply for it a formal receipt for their next quarter's rent.*

But he also noted the new solidarity which the growth of an open class war was breeding amongst property-owners, especially in the countryside. "There was no more jealousy or pride displayed between the peasant and the squire, the nobleman and the commoner; instead, I found mutual confidence, reciprocal friendliness, and regard. Property had become, with all those who owned it, a sort of bond of fraternity. The wealthy were the elder, the less endowed the younger brothers; but all considered themselves members of one family, having the same interest in defending the common inheritance."†

While this new-found 'fraternity' was solid enough to help in making the Second Republic yet another middle-class régime, and to place it at the mercy of Louis Napoleon, the urban working-class spirit of republican 'fraternity', which Louis Blanc had hoped to find in the "right to work" and in "national workshops", quickly came to nought. The actual experiment in national workshops was not, of course, in any way a fulfilment of Blanc's hopes and met with his own direct disapproval. But the disastrous failure of the experiment discredited the idea, and the socialistic applications of the ideal again became the property of the extreme revolutionaries, just as after the failure of the Babeuf Plot in 1796.

The low survival value of the Second Republic, and the *coup d'état* of Louis Napoleon three years after its foundation, soured the high hopes of the February Revolution. But 1848—the year of revolutions in Europe—had been a moral triumph for the concept of fraternity nursed by the international liberal societies. The revolutionaries of each country really had come out into the open in support of one another, and they had shown how fragile was the system of the restoration in Europe. Whatever happened, after the failures of 1848, there could be no mere continuation of the order which had existed before 1848. The new twist given to the idea of fraternity throws some light on the nature of what did happen.

As Mr. Max Beloff has put it: "It was not the ideas of the French Revolution but the reaction against them that dominated the following three decades. The brotherhood of peoples was replaced by the cousinhood of crowned heads."‡ But now, after the 'Year of Revolutions', if there was still to be no brotherhood of peoples, neither could there be a cousinhood of kings. One reason was that the revolutionary ideal had

* *ibid* p. 114.

† *ibid* p. 99.

‡ *A Hundred Years of Revolution*, ed. George Woodcock (1948), p. 44.

now spread to the new industrial urban proletariat of Europe. All the main revolutions of 1848 were urban revolutions, like that of Paris. "For the first time news of a revolution passed from one town to another by telegraph; it no longer needed to filter through, and so to affect, the countryside. The revolutionaries travelled by train from one revolution to the next; they had neither eyes nor thoughts for the country through which they passed."* Fraternity now would mean the bonds that are common to all wage-earners, even if these bonds did not unite all wage-earners in the way that the new apostle of their rights, Karl Marx, hoped. Fraternity, turning sour in the mouths of the optimistic liberals, became peculiarly a concept of the working classes.

At the same time, it became peculiarly a concept in the history of nationalism.† And this in no way conflicted with its new alliance with socialism. Early socialism was internationalist in outlook mainly because liberalism was internationalist, and the two movements shared the same optimism. "It must never be forgotten that the Chartists, Marx and Engels, Proudhon and Bakunin, lived or at any rate were young in the hey-day of liberalism."‡ Internationalism was not even a peculiarly socialist creed; it was a liberal ideal, borrowed by the socialists from the liberals of their day. In so far as socialists like Louis Blanc looked to the nation-State to "organize fraternity, socially and economically, they were looking to a strengthening of the State and were going counter to the general liberal assumption that the State would take a less and less active part in the lives of men. The more they demanded that the State should "organize fraternity" the more they supported the nation-State at the expense of liberal internationalism.

It is noteworthy that even before 1848 the principle of fraternity was itself being criticized from opposite quarters because of its vague internationalist flavour. Mazzini opposed to it the principle of "association". "Brotherhood does not include a common social ideal for men on earth: it does not include even its necessity: it has no essential necessary relation to the development of a purpose, that shall bind together in harmony all our faculties and powers. Brotherhood is certainly the base of every society, the first condition of social progress, but it is not progress itself . . . The principle of brotherhood is compatible with movement in a circle. And the human mind began to understand that *brotherhood*—the necessary link between two principles of *liberty* and *equality*, that epitomise the *individualistic* philosophy—never passes

* A. J. P. Taylor in *The Opening of an Era: 1848* (1948), ed. F. Fejtő.

† The nationalistic use of the idea had doubtless been prepared from the first by the very imagery of patriotism; a common 'fatherland' implies a common 'brotherhood'—*allons enfants de la Patrie*.

‡ F. Borkenau: *Socialism, National or International* (1942), p. 36. cf. E. H. Carr: "Like Mazzini and other nineteenth-century thinkers, Marx thought of nationalism as a natural stepping-stone to internationalism." *Studies in Revolution* (1950), p. 27.

beyond their limits, that its activity can only operate between individuals, that it easily assumes the name of *charity*, that though it can fix the starting-point whence Humanity should reach the social Ideal, it can never be substituted for it.”* For Mazzini, in short, fraternity was not enough.

Lamartine, on the other hand, condemned it as too much. He wrote of the adherents of Saint-Simon, Fourier, Cabet, Raspail, Pierre Leroux and Louis Blanc as holding views of which “the essence was a chimerical fraternity to be realized on earth, and tending towards the suppression of individual property These systems were the poetry of communism, intoxicating with Utopian aspirations, and avenging the cause of men dissatisfied with social order.”† He clung to the vaguer liberal sense of fraternity as charity—the sense which Mazzini condemned. As he reminded the Paris mob, in his popular harangues on the formation of the provisional Government: “I have always aspired to a more fraternal government, and one with laws more imbued with the charity which unites us at this moment”‡ When that spirit was “organized” into more specific social legislation, Lamartine drew back from its consequences.

In this way the revolution of 1848 greatly clarified the contrast between two concepts of fraternity. Liberals like Lamartine clung to its sense as a diffused charitable spirit of “brotherliness”, the individualistic basis for a form of government resting on persuasion and consent. Even Louis Blanc, in 1847, had described it as involving *le volontaire assentiment des coeurs*. On the other hand the socialistic revolutionaries had evolved a conception of fraternity as a fully organized “brotherhood”, involving social legislation and organization of what would to-day be called social welfare. The citizens of a socialist society, sharing a common patrimony like brothers, should organize their whole community so as to remove such impediments to brotherliness as extreme poverty and unemployment. The liberals hoped that the removal of inequalities of political franchise would demolish the main barrier; the socialists impatiently demanded that the principles of private property be modified enough to diminish economic inequalities. This conflict between the notion of fraternity as mere benevolent “brotherliness” and the notion of it as an organized “brotherhood” marked the parting of the ways between liberalism and social democracy.

Louis Blanc himself hovered at the cross-roads, and became in effect the advocate of State socialism, but of State socialism as the guardian and promoter of individual rights. And even more extreme revolutionaries than Blanc did not yet extend the socialistic application of fraternity

* Joseph Mazzini: *Faith and the Future*, written in 1835, in reaction against the failures of the revolutions of 1830.

† A. de Lamartine: *History of the French Revolution of 1848*, (1849), p. 52 of English translation.

‡ *ibid.* p. 234.

to international affairs because, as already shown, most socialists still clung to the traditional liberal notions of internationalism and looked on "brotherliness" as enough in that sphere. It was to the organization of fraternity in social and economic life within each State that the revolution of 1848 turned men's minds.

In the form of "association", the idea spread beyond the specifically socialistic thinkers to liberals like Mazzini. Louis Blanc, supporting not only more active association among workers but also more positive action by the State to provide for the greater well-being of its citizens, again overlapped both trends of thought. In his programme submitted to the provisional Government by the Luxembourg Commission he wrote: "Two great ideas, necessary corollaries of the sentiments of equality and fraternity, alone possess the power at the present time of reconstructing and enriching: on the one hand association, the principle of all strength and of all economy; on the other, the disinterested intervention of the State—the principle of all order, all distributive justice, and all unity."* At the same time Proudhon, distrusting the State as much as ever, saw in the idea of multiple voluntary contracts a more comprehensive application of the idea of both "fraternity" and "association."†

The experience of 1848-1849 brought the parting of the ways not only between liberalism and social democracy, but also between social democracy and communism. The *Communist Manifesto* was published in London early in 1848, a few days before the February Revolution broke out in Paris. At first Marx shared the high hopes of the revolutionaries, but he soon came to distrust and condemn the turn which events took. The June Days drove him into violent denunciation. In the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* he wrote: "The fraternity of the two opposing classes (one of which exploits the other) which in February was inscribed in huge letters upon all the façades of Paris, upon all the prisons and all the barracks . . . this fraternity lasted just so long as the interests of the bourgeoisie could fraternize with the interests of the proletariat." In his pamphlets on *The Class Struggles in France* and *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* he deduced the lessons for the future. He wrote bitterly of: "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity . . . when what this Republic really means is Infantry, Cavalry, Artillery." It was a lesson which endorsed Marx's thesis that a revolution which neglected the realities of the class war would be utterly frustrated. He saw the history of the Second Republic as a travesty of the First. In 1789 each stage had been more violent and more revolutionary than the last; in 1848 each phase had been more reactionary than the last. And the illusion of

* Quoted George Woodcock: *A Hundred Years of Revolution*, p. 221.

† cf. Proudhon, *Idée générale de la Révolution* (6e. étude): "Le contrat, c'est la Fraternité puisqu'il identifie les intérêts, ramène à l'unité toutes les divergences, résout toutes les contradictions, et, par conséquent, rend l'essor aux sentiments de bienveillance et de dévouement que refoulait (sic) l'anarchie économique, le gouvernement des représentants, la loi étrangère."

'fraternity' had played a constant part in the whole disaster. "The phrase which corresponded to this imagined liquidation of class relations was *fraternité*, universal fraternization and brotherhood. This pleasant abstraction from class antagonisms, this sentimental equalization of contradictory class interests, this fantastic elevation above the class struggle, was the special catch-cry of the February Revolution. The classes were divided by a mere misunderstanding and Lamartine baptized the provisional Government on February 24 as "*un gouvernement qui suspende ce malentendu terrible qui existe entre les différentes classes*. The Parisian proletariat revelled in this generous intoxication of fraternity."*

Marx sought to replace this delusive fraternity between classes by the revolutionary fraternity between the proletarians of each country. The International was the true pattern of fraternity, and any other form was illusory. "Comrade" was a better appellation than "brother" for communist politics.

For these reasons, from 1848 onwards, the idea of fraternity entered into the development of political thought in three ways. In liberal-democratic thought it was expected that universal suffrage would lead to what may be called 'the nationalizing of fraternity.' In social-democratic thought, it was expected that the growth of State responsibility for welfare would lead to 'the fraternalizing of nationalism.' In communist revolutionary thought, it was expected that the growth of proletarian solidarity and class-consciousness would lead to 'the internationalizing of fraternity.' It depended on the answer given to the question: "Who is my brother?" Should the answer be 'fellow-citizen', 'fellow-worker', or 'fellow-proletarian'? During the last hundred years, all three answers have continued to be given. If the most frequent and most firm answer has normally been 'fellow-citizen' it is because enthusiasts have too often forgotten that the usual limited human reaction is that expressed by Sir James Fitzjames Stephen. "Show me a definite person doing a definite thing and I will tell you whether he is my friend or my enemy; but as to calling all human creatures indiscriminately my brothers and sisters, I will do no such thing. I have far too much respect for real relations to give these endearing names to all sorts of people of whom I know, and for whom, practically speaking, I care nothing at all."†

(The first part of this article by Dr. Thomson—Fellow and Senior Tutor of Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge, and a University Lecturer in History—was published in the May issue of THE FORTNIGHTLY.)

* *The Class Struggles in France*, p. 44.

† Sir J. Fitzjames Stephen: *Liberty, Equality, Fraternity* (1873), p. 304.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of THE FORTNIGHTLY,

THE FOURTH YEAR OF ISRAEL

Sir,

I would like to reply briefly to the remarks of the four commentators, published in your May 1952 issue, about my article.

First, Mr. Israel Cohen comments justly on "the dynamic intellectual activity" in the small land. My reason for silence about the development of literature, art and music is that I had referred to them in a previous article which I wrote on "The Third Year of Israel" in the May 1951 number of THE FORTNIGHTLY. And there were not any striking new developments to record.

Mr. Neville Laski draws attention to three major problems: the mass immigration from the Oriental Jewish communities, the refusal of the Arab world to trade with Israel, and the apparently insoluble problem of the Arab refugees. Nothing in Israel's policy has been more admirable than the willingness to take in whole communities in distress without discrimination on the grounds of age, sickness or incapacity. And though the burden of social aid for such cases must be heavy for years to come, the old and the maimed will pass away, leaving the young and the healthy integrated in the nation. As to the second problem, which is stressed also by Mr. Owen Tweedy as a major peril of Israel, I would be the last to belittle its seriousness. I emphasized that peace with the Arab States, which has eluded all the efforts for three years, is the most vital of Israel's needs. The cold war in the Middle East accentuates every hardship of life. Yet I believe that, though some of the children of Israel murmur, and a few immigrants give up the struggle, the mass are prepared to stick it out. And the prospects of peace negotiations with the Arab States are at least better in the fifth than they were in the fourth year. For to-day the western powers are as anxious as Israel to have peace in the Middle East, and are not only seeking it, but pursuing it.

As to the third hurdle, the settlement of the Arab refugees, without undue optimism I hope that a solution is nearer. The unanimous adoption, by the last Assembly of the United Nations of the plans for employment of the able-bodied refugees in the countries where they now are living "in restless, resentful idleness," gives a prospect that at last the Arab States and western democracies will co-operate in the first steps towards the permanent solution.

Mr. Dov B. Sherira comments that in my survey I omitted mention of the demands by the Government of Israel for reparations from Germany, which "is a matter of particular importance." In mitigation I may urge that I had dealt at some length with that subject in an article "German Restitution and Reparation" in the January 1952 FORTNIGHTLY, and I omitted it in the survey of Israel's fourth year because, when I wrote, the issue was still indefinite. Negotiations were proceeding, and violent protests against them were disturbing the peace of Israel. But the practical outcome was still uncertain.

Lastly, Mr. Tweedy comments on the grave injury done by the Arab boycott of Israel and on Israel's present isolation. The solution, he says, must be found in the Middle East, and not in New York or anywhere else. I am in full agreement with him that

peace depends on direct negotiations between Israel and the Arab States, and not on the diplomatic web of conciliation commissions. The example, however, of the Armistice Agreements, brought about in 1949 between Israel and the Arab States with the resolute and skilful help of the United Nations' mediator, Dr. Bunche, suggests that negotiations between Israel and each of her neighbours in turn, with an "honest broker" to help, may at last break the deadlock.

Yours faithfully,

NORMAN BENTWICH.

London, N.W.3.

SETTLING IN NEW ZEALAND A CENTURY AGO

A POSTSCRIPT

In the March 1952 issue of *THE FORTNIGHTLY* were published two letters from C. M. Igglesden in New Zealand written nearly a century ago to his friend in England, W. Watkins. The latter's son, Mr. W. G. Watkins of Lincoln, in whose possession the letters have been, has received some replies to his suggestion that descendants or other relatives should communicate with him. Two surviving daughters and one surviving son of C. M. Igglesden are living in New Zealand and, only in November 1951, Miss Milly Igglesden, a well known art teacher, just before her death at Wellington gave several of her father's letters to a sister; in these "Johnson, Inman, Finden, Watkins" and himself were described as being "great chums". The recipient, Mrs. Lena Goulter of Wellington, has written to Mr. W. G. Watkins giving particulars of her father's life "as Architect, Surveyor and Engineer in the Public Service of the Colony," and of his death in 1920 at the age of 88.

The original letters are on the way to Mrs. Goulter, who has promised the General Assembly Library of Parliament House, Wellington (whose Chief Librarian also wrote to Mr. W. G. Watkins), that she will "hand them over" to be added to the collection of New Zealand documents which is proving of great value to students of history.

THE FORTNIGHTLY LIBRARY

THE DAMNABLE PACT

BY NORMAN NICHOLSON

There are certain moments in literature which become part of folk-culture, part of the mental furniture of those who may know nothing at all about the source of the story. They are moments, for the most part, which image some common crisis or reveal the tension point between conflicting social forces or between human aspirations and human fears. Such moments arise when *Oliver Twist* asks for more, when *Crusoe* finds the footprint on the sand, and when *Faust* sells his soul. In Germany, of course, this latter scene came from folklore in the first place, but in England it came from literature, from Marlowe, and in Marlowe the story is essentially tragic. The folk tale was concerned as much with the devil's buffoonery as with his malevolence—but in Marlowe it is the damnable and damning pact which compels the imagination above all else.

Yet, in fact, by approaching the *Faust* story at this point we are coming in at the middle. The Marlovian *Faust* is a product of the late Middle Ages and the Reformation, but behind him is the ritual and magic of a pre-Christian era, and according to Miss Butler* it is the conflict between these two conceptions which has influenced the history of the legend. I have not read her two earlier books on this subject, but if I understand rightly the implications of this third, she believes that the figure of *Faust* emerges from the old fertility cults, the rites of the Dying God and the functions of the priest-king. Here the figure was entirely beneficent, facing mystery and danger for the sake of the tribe, and in certain circumstances accepting a sacrificial death. But as Christianity superseded the primitive religions, the old magical practices were condemned as evil, and wizards were regarded as men who held traffic with the

devil. Out of this came the legend of the damnable pact. At first there was no doubt whatever about the damnation. The original anonymous *Faust* book, published by Johann Spiess in 1587 and translated into English in 1592, had a splendid Lutheran gloom about it; the fate of *Faust* is the inevitable result of "his pride and arrogance, despair, audacity, and insolence like unto those giants of whom the poets sing that they carried the mountains together and were fain to make war on God."

But the popular reader did not intend to be drowned in despair for *Faust's* sake. Damnation was a real thing, a terrifying thing, but it did not do to think of it all the while. So, to quieten deep-seated fears, *Faust* and his devils were made to look ridiculous at least for a time. It was, says Miss Butler, the old, hidden faith in ritual and magic reasserting itself in a grotesque way. When in Marlowe's version *Faustus* tweaks off the food from beneath the nose of the pope, we cannot but feel, whoever may have written this passage, that it is unworthy of the rest of that stupendous tragedy. Yet the buffoonery satisfied a very real need. The jests about the bunch-of-hay horse and the bunch-of-grape noses, the comic imps, the servant's parody of the pact with the devil—all these give a feeling of temporary relief, even of security, to the spectator. So in the period which followed Marlowe we find that the story was immensely popular both with barnstormers and with puppet masters. It became as homely as pantomime, as rollicking as *Punch and Judy*. *Casper*, the comic servant, became almost as important a character as *Faust* himself, conjuring up the devil yet managing to cheat him of his soul, and in one version acting as night watchman and calling out

* *The Fortunes of Faust*, by E. M. Butler. Cambridge University Press, 30s.

the hours in ribald songs as Faust's end draws near.

The elemental terror of the theme was not forgotten, however, and even in the crudest of productions it came closer to the audience than it is easy for us to imagine to-day. There is the celebrated performance at Exeter when the actors in the incantation scene realized that "there was a devil too many among them." Even the puppet plays could reach depths of tragic feeling beside which our modern stage looks as shallow as a paddling pool: "What would you do in my place, Mephistopheles, to obtain the grace of God?" asks Faust in the Augsburg puppet play. And the devil replies:

Ah Faustus, if there were a ladder stretching from earth to heaven, made of swords instead of rungs so that I should be cut into a thousand pieces with every step I took, yet would I strive to reach the summit, so that I might behold the face of God but once more.

When Faust first emerged in 1587, his tragedy was that of a single soul, but gradually it revealed itself as the tragedy of modern man. To the poets of the eighteenth century it seemed evident that Faust's sin was merely that of eating the tree of knowledge, that, in fact, he represented the new aspirations of man, struggling against superstition, ignorance, and the darker mysteries of science and his own nature. That such a man should be damned was unthinkable, and from that time almost to the present day, many have tried to find a way in which he could escape his fate.

Miss Butler gives an exhaustive (and at times exhausting) study to the many variations of these two themes—that of that damned Faust and that of the saved Faust; of doublings and doublings back; of parings and clashes and compromises—from Lessing, Goethe, Byron, Lenau. At times we almost lose sight of the original tale as it is divided and subdivided and filed away in so many different cabinets. Even Goethe's own contribution comes under three separated headings—"An imperishable Faust", "An unearthly Helen" and "The Apotheosis of Faust."

And then, in the despair of our own times, the original Faust has come back. Thomas Mann tells his story in a modern setting, turning the magician into a musician; Paul Valéry sees that intellectual curiosity, unlimited and uncontrolled, leads inevitably to the atom bomb and primeval chaos all over again. Surely, says Miss Butler, the first biographers of Faust were prophetic in their suspicious fear of the passion for knowledge.

Yet was it really knowledge that Faust sought? If so, it was knowledge not as an end in itself but as a means to power. That, indeed, is also the modern error. For the father of lies can have no monopoly of truth but only of the misuse of truth, and to attribute the damnation of Faust to his search for knowledge is both unrealistic and sentimental. His guilt lay, not in searching, but in searching in the wrong shop.

PORTRAIT OF EUROPE, by Salvador de Madariaga. *Hollis & Carter.* 18s.

Don Salvador de Madariaga, the prototype of the world citizen, touches nothing that he does not illuminate with truly Chestertonian "predetermined paradox and embodied antithesis." This "mural fresco of European life" is a supreme example of his art. Those, however, who expect to find here political quartz, who look for light and leading on the problems of structure and organization so hotly debated among parliamentarians will be disappointed; let them reflect that this twinkling Spaniard, while he has played a part on the international political stage (and even served his country as an Ambassador and as a Minister), studied to be an engineer—and began life as a *littérateur*. (He has to his credit—in Spanish—volumes of poetry and plays, and his study *On Hamlet*, together with a translation of Shakespeare's play into Spanish verse, will be familiar to a number of English readers.) It is in the realm of ideas and symbols, not that of politics, that he is really at home, and his con-

nection with Europe as she is being formed in the crucible of Strasbourg begins and ends with his contribution as Chairman of the Cultural Committee of the European Movement.

But for any one who delights in pretidigitation with ideas—based, be it said, on acute observation—and appreciates intellectual larks, this little volume is sheer joy. The author starts from the fact (which he has many times before brought out) that the men and nations of Europe, with all their close physical solidarity, are still alas! substantially lacking in moral solidarity; there is a pertinent simile of streams of cars circulating on a narrow road and the presumable feelings of the drivers towards one another. And he goes on to make the usual, and indeed essential, point that Europe's genius consists precisely in the variety within unity, the respective "vintages" of national types, which go to make up the peculiarly European pattern of quality, of distinction. It is in the next step taken here that he rings the bell and gets his money back, so to speak, when he observes, rightly enough, that ventilation is eminently desirable, that the unity of Europe is in fact well served by bringing out into the light of day the various tensions between the several nations.

This he proceeds to do by taking the principal national types in pairs (as also certain lesser nations) and analysing their characteristics with coruscating brilliance, rather in the manner of his quasi-mathematical study of *Englishmen*, *Frenchmen*, *Spaniards* of more than twenty years ago. To quote here from the author's verbal felicities would be to spoil the fun for the reader; and for the quidnuncs and sobersides who may be heard tut-tutting at some of the far-fetched conceits he has his answer ready in an incidental remark: "I am, of course, exaggerating and pushing a relative fact to the edge of its absolute so as to make it stand out clearly." For my part I applaud most his discovery that "the Irish are Spaniards who have lost their way and got stranded in the north

where they do not belong"—besides being as a result of history "deeply anglicised".

I have only one quarrel with Señor de Madariaga: that is when he observes *en passant* that "French is the easiest language for an Englishman to learn"—which is just not true. And surely his wife, a Scotswoman, (or his publisher) should have told him that the national adjective is Scottish, *not* Scotch, which is an appellation reserved for whisky.

W. HORSFALL CARTER

THE BLIND EYE OF HISTORY:

A Study of the Origins of the present Police Era, by Charles Reith. *Faber & Faber*. 18s.

Mr. Reith, already the author of two or three excellent historical studies of the British police, has a complaint against historians. He accuses them of being blind to the importance of machinery for the enforcement of law as a factor in historical development. He contends that there have been, broadly, two forms of police organization in history: the 'tribal kin police', wherein responsibility for enforcing laws is shared by the community as a whole, and 'ruler-appointed police' or *gendarmérie*, where in the responsibility is entrusted to a militarily organized group. He sees in the first form the principles which led to the democratic system of police now existing in Britain, the Commonwealth and the United States; in the second, the normal European pattern, and the origins of the totalitarian police-systems of modern dictatorships. In exposition of this thesis he ranges widely throughout history, from ancient Egypt and Anglo-Saxon England to present-day America and Soviet Russia. The result is an extremely interesting book, provocative and stimulating, written with verve and at times pugnacity. And it is all to the good that both legal and political historians should be reminded of the practical aspects of law enforcement which are only too often neglected or misunderstood.

Yet Mr. Reith greatly overstates his

case, and his use of historical evidence is often open to severe criticism. He is apt to make claims of historical importance for the specific form (or absence) of police organization which are much more lopsided than the judgments of orthodox historians on which he pours so much scorn. To dub John Wilkes "the paid and heavily financed tool of City merchants in London" and to ascribe "the basic cause of the initiation of the [American] War of Independence" to the activities of Samuel Adams and his followers, is surely to over-simplify complicated historical situations. The historian, so frequently scolded by the author for turning a blind eye to such startling simplifications, would be justified in retorting that he has in fact seen more than Mr. Reith and that he is trained to avoid distorting mirrors. He might add, on some points, that the alleged gaps lie less in the writings of historians than in Mr. Reith's reading of them. When the author announces (p. 242) that "in the course of the transition from feudalism to nationalism in Europe, the fact which has mattered most to posterity has escaped the notice of historians" and goes on to describe this fact as the problems and devices of the new monarchies for maintaining order in their domains, he reveals a strange innocence of a mass of serious historical study.

The author writes, too, as if the mere absence of the device of 'kin-police' was in itself the cause of historical situations, and is apt to neglect the economic and political conditions which explain both the absence of the device and the events which he ascribes to its absence. Despite these faults, the book is well worth attention. It has delicious pen-pictures of men like Jonathan Wild, the forerunner of all modern gangsters, and a most ingenious interpretation of Britain's military failures in the American War of Independence which no future historian of that war can afford to neglect.

DAVID THOMSON

THE BOLSHEVIK REVOLUTION, 1917-1923. Vol. II. By E. H. Carr. Macmillan. 30s.

This volume of Professor Carr's history traces the development of the Russian economy from the early days of the Revolution to the time of Lenin's death. The combined effects, of war and revolution plunged the already backward economy of the country into a state of chaos, and so added to the foreseen ideological and practical difficulties of creating a socialist society in a backward country a formidable category of problems for which no solutions had been prepared or even considered.

The chief of these were that both industrial and agricultural production had fallen dramatically since 1914, and that it was clear to Lenin and his colleagues that unless these trends were reversed the Revolution could not succeed. The main difficulties were that the increased production of food and its efficient distribution could not be achieved without the support of the peasants, and that the output of industry could not be raised without at least some considerable measure of help from technical experts whose social origins and political convictions did not dispose them favourably to the revolutionary rulers. The experiments of workers' control in industry, and of sending gangs of armed and half-disciplined ruffians to loot the countryside in the supposed interests of the town dwellers, speedily broke down. What was to take their place? This, in the sphere of economic organization, was the primary problem of the revolutionary period.

In Bolshevik theory the solution of the agricultural problem was the nationalization of all the land, and the concentration of production, so far as possible, in large farming units. To this the social revolutionaries opposed the far more appealing if less efficient solution of nationalizing only the landlords' land and redistributing it to the peasants. In fact, after the Bolsheviks had achieved a theoretical victory, events took control; the peasants acted on their

own counsel, at least in many of the provinces, and the social revolutionary solution was to a large extent forced upon the Bolsheviks, whose contribution was limited to guiding events by stimulating a class war between the poorer and the richer peasants. It was this situation which forced upon Lenin the New Economic Policy, whose "initial and cardinal measure" in Professor Carr's words was "the substitution of the tax in kind for the requisitioning of surpluses." As a substitute for the much hated requisitioning the peasant was to earn, by prompt and full payment of the tax, the right to use his surplus to sell on a free market, and by this means the disastrous situation that the famine of 1921 superimposed on war and revolution was allayed.

N.E.P. was primarily agricultural, not industrial, and it was introduced after all industrial undertakings had been nationalized. Its effects were therefore less far-reaching, and its reversal was carried out without the convulsions that later accompanied "the liquidation of the kulaks." N.E.P. achieved its objective, and thereafter the Communists set about achieving their aim of a completely planned and socialized economy. The struggles between the different schools of planners—those who advocated one central plan, those who believed in a number of specific projects, Lenin, with his passion for electrification, Trotsky, with his fanatical belief in a ruthless central direction—are described in the last chapter of this fascinating and illuminating book, which shows the scene set for the feuds that followed Lenin's death.

W. T. WELLS

AUSTRALIA, by R. M. Crawford.
Hutchinson. 8s. 6d.

The recent drastic import cuts made by the Australian Government took many otherwise well-educated people in Great Britain completely by surprise. It was a measure of our general ignorance of the great Dominions to which this country has given birth. The reading

of even a popular historical study of Australia, such as this one by the professor of History at Melbourne University, might have been expected at least to prepare their minds against an eventuality whose causes are neither superficial nor immediate but deep-rooted and long-standing.

Professor Crawford does well to begin his survey with a chapter on "The Land", for nine-tenths of Australia's troubles—and they are many—stem from its intractable nature and its unfortunate location on the globe. The legend of *Australia Felix* dies hard; but as Mr. Crawford quickly points out, of the Commonwealth's 3,000,000 square miles 600,000 "are unused and unusable," another 700,000 "good only for sparse pastoral occupation," barely one quarter receive enough rain to render agriculture possible and of those "much is mountainous."

The result is that as Australia's population has increased so it has (except during the early pioneering days) steadily retreated from the interior to the coast, and in particular to the five capital cities of Brisbane, Sydney, Melbourne, Adelaide and Perth, which to-day with their environs house close on two-thirds of the total continental population. This has meant increasing industrialization and commercialization and, relatively, a decreasing number of people engaged in agricultural and pastoral occupations. Yet throughout her century and a half of white history Australia has depended (brief "gold rushes" apart) for her livelihood upon her primary products, which in 1928 made up 96 per cent. of her exports and, as late as 1950, 85 per cent.

If, then, what Australia has in the main to offer are a scorching sun, arid or unprofitable soil (even in well-watered districts this is often poor), frequently recurrent droughts and yet more frequent bush fires—capable of devastating areas as large as England in a couple of days—why, it may be asked, have people persisted in emigrating there? (In parenthesis, relatively not so many have; for every one who has gone from Great

Britain to Australia, ten have gone to North America.) Gold is one answer; between 1851 and 1861 the population of Victoria alone rose from 77,000 to 540,000. Wool is another, and a general vague longing to start afresh and to make a fortune in the wide open spaces is a third.

But constant throughout has been another desire; to escape from the hierarchy of European society into a land where it was agreed that "every man should start fair in life, and have the same chance of making his way through the world." Professor Crawford's book is essentially a study of the making of Australian democracy, a democracy unique in kind and as yet far from fully fashioned. As he shows, that democracy has faced and survived many crises. To-day it faces a dual threat, probably the gravest in its history: the menace of Asia's underfed millions and the unbalance of its internal economy. It will need all the combination of courage, practicality, and insouciance in the Australian character to survive this threat.

H. C. DENT

ALL SOULS, by Ruth Tomalin.
Faber & Faber. 12s. 6d.

In the time of the Great Plague a poor, harmless old woman who had returned to her native village, Long Peace, to take possession of a neglected home, was charged with witchcraft and burned alive. This tragic happening provides the Prologue to *All Souls*, a strange and sometimes bewildering story by Ruth Tomalin whose intimate knowledge of bird and beast, flower and butterfly serves to invest an obscure theme with definite charm. Her men, women and children have uncommon names as well as strange manners and relationships are sometimes hard to follow. Mouse, Willow, Dusky, Piers Yeo, Mars Hussy, Vanessa all present certain difficulties and challenge the careless reader, in a realm where nobody seems to be quite normal or to do worthwhile things. There is a vicar whose chief concern is entomology rather than

parochial affairs, a schoolmistress with an illegitimate child in the school, and a mysterious housekeeper. Long Peace harbours an unfriendly community to which the children who intervene make little more than a negligible contribution. What is there in the face of this unpromising material that compels a second reading, in order that the end may explain the beginning? Perhaps we are moved to recover the story from an enveloping cloud of butterflies, birds and flowers, while paying due tribute to the seeing eye, the listening ear and the vivid imagination that atone for faults in construction and emphasis.

A first perusal demanded a second, the second called for a third that the survey might be complete. *All Souls* stands remote from the marketplace and its conventions, while for the student of wild life there is an appeal in every chapter. Years of close observation and a whole hearted response must have gone to build up the natural history side and to provide a setting that acts as an antidote to impediments in the narrative.

By reason of its love, pity and awareness this book refuses to be forgotten. The author has brought to her service clear recognition of the fulness and emptiness of village life, its good humour and rancour, its prejudice and limitations, its normal kindness and latent cruelties. There is a suggestion that the old evil, set out in the Prologue, is still active to-day, that the murder of a helpless woman had certain effects that centuries cannot obliterate. This was the teaching of Gautama the Buddha, and is held by millions of his followers to this hour, but it sounds strange in the twentieth century and the south of England.

Lo! as hid seed shoots after rainless years
So good and evil, pains and pleasures, hates
And loves, and all dead deeds come forth
again.

I think that when Miss Tomalin has mastered the technique of storytelling she should command a large and sympathetic audience. At present we find ourselves in an ill-planned house with many beautiful pictures on the walls.

S. L. BENSUSAN

THE FORTNIGHTLY LIBRARY

BOOKS ON THE TABLE

From a month that has included a visit to the Leonardo da Vinci drawings, to the home of Bernard Shaw at Ayot St. Lawrence, to Sir Max Beerbohm's 80th birthday exhibition, to the Royal Society of Arts illustrated lecture by Michael Ayrton on Giovanni Pisano, and to the summer Academy, the connecting stem is easy to trace.

Glory that was Greece

It is joined (for one whose deploring eyes have beheld *The Last Supper* peeling on the wall in Milan, who has risked death from racing traffic in the quick-falling dusk of Rapallo to watch the light in the upper room of Sir Max's villa, and who first encountered the sculptures of Pisano in the cities of Tuscany) to **THE ROOT OF EUROPE** (*Chatto & Windus*. 15s.)—the common inheritance, and the source of all our delight, often unconsciously, and but dazedly in the dazzle of it on our fleeting trips to that tired and torn and glorious old continent. Michael Huxley has edited and prefaced these "studies in the diffusion of Greek culture" to show that nevertheless the branches labelled Macedon and the east; Greece in Rome, and in the early medieval west; the Moslem carriers; the Renaissance; Byzantium and the high middle ages; Byzantium and the east and the north, and Byzantine influences in Russia, all belong to the same tree, the political crisis of to-day being due to the deviation of those principles that animated Athens. The scope and interests of the contributors range from the headmastership of Harrow and the care of the coins in the Ashmolean, Oxford, to the professorship of Byzantine history at Harvard and the directorship of London's Science Museum. Assisted by dozens of beautifully clear illustrations and 17 most illuminating maps, and accompanied by a bibliography that should satisfy the hungriest needs of further reading, they have been able to make an engrossing book at a comparatively cheap price look handsome as well.

How it is done

One of the first hunters of handsome books brought the ancient Greek authors to Europe as early as the fourteenth century. Now, a series of lectures delivered under the authority of the Antiquarian Booksellers' Association has been assembled in **TALKS ON BOOK-COLLECTING** (*Cassell*. 12s. 6d.) edited by P. H. Muir, who also contributes the first paper. Those who follow, like him all "eminent authorities", discuss the various aspects, either from the seller's or the keeper's point of view. They speak of the period before printing, of the language and the fashions of the cult, of binding and binders, of milestones in publishing and, in a last lecture by Ifan Kyrle Fletcher, of one especially rewarding field—from playbills to Ellen Terry's letters—in the theatre. As should be expected, the volume with its numerous facsimiles and photographs is a credit to the trade.

ELIA

Who, having read Charles Lamb, does not remember "My First Play", "Some of the Old Actors", "Stage Illusion" and "Artificial Comedy" and, even more pertinent to the general subject of the foregoing symposium, "Detached Thoughts on Books and Reading"? Here, the essayist is anything but 'detached' in his enthusiasm and dislikes and when he says: "In some respects the better a book is, the less it demands in binding" we heartily concur. And we agree just as heartily with,

where a book is at once both good and rare . . . no casket is rich enough, no casing sufficiently durable, to honour and keep safe such a jewel.

So that—although it is true that to read is paramount and what the book looks like doesn't much matter—it is no contradiction to say that the rich casket of **THE ESSAYS AND THE LAST ESSAYS OF ELIA** (*Macdonald Illustrated Classics*. 9s. 6d.) on the table receives a warm invitation to replace the tattered, old and dingy secondhand copy (and of no

antiquarian value) on the shelf. Malcolm Elwin's Introduction to the trim, gold-lettered, shining cellophane-wrapped newcomer is both biography and interpretation of man and writer—the one often tiresome, the other never, “well, hardly ever.”

Seats of learning

And never when he writes of “Christ’s Hospital,” “The Old and the New Schoolmaster” and “Oxford in the Vacation.” Lamb would have enjoyed the autobiography of schooldays that strictly comes next; then there are two novels about schoolmistresses, but any consideration of the mysteries of pedagogy might well begin here, like charity, with *THE STORY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF LONDON*: What and where it is (*John Murray*. 3s. 6d.). R. J. S. McDowall and D. M. Gurney have compiled a useful survey mainly to make its own students “University conscious”. But as the booklet explains the complexities of this federation of colleges (many of them much older than the 100 years of their binding together) which has grown into one of the largest universities in the world, the outsider who is also a London-lover will appreciate learning something of the history and attainment of so many and diverse institutions. Some we take for granted; others we snort over unkindly because their products sometimes excite our contumely; some we warmly admire, and others we are surprised—and delighted—to find included.

No snail

There are but three hindrances to delight in Hubert Van Zeller's account of his schooldays at Downside: the title *WILLINGLY TO SCHOOL* (*Sheed & Ward*. 18s.)—there should be a society for the suppression of torturing Shakespeare; the too hearty ‘blurb’ (not cramming “Moral Uplift down the reader's maw” indeed!), and the comic-strip-ish illustration on the dust jacket. So by simply removing this, it is easy to enjoy thoroughly surely one of the best autobiographies of its kind: with its au-

thentic conveying of what it felt like to be young and, literally, in the monastic community of school life; with a vivid sense of the ridiculous in sundry solemn moments; with its humour flowing unforced from the first “pre-preparatory” episode which kept laughter strangling the words as I tried to read them aloud, and with the wisdom all the more profound for being unstressed. The author has another great gift, for drawing the Beerbohm-ish caricatures (filled in and portraying the man within no less than his face and form) which adorn the book. And the happy schoolboy has apparently happily merged his endowments with his greatest vocation, for he is now a monk at Downside.

Teaching Girls

The first of the two *Putman* novels (12s. 6d. each), *NOUGHTS AND CROSSES* by Jacobine Hichens, concerns the struggles of a Protestant teacher (in a school somewhat vaguely run on the antics of a headmistress rather too obviously a ‘copy’ provider for Miss Joyce Grenfell) to resist, or not to resist, marrying the Roman Catholic she loves. All who have lingered on this brink fearing to launch away will recognize its truth. The calm, kind priest, knowing more than she could tell, answering all her questionings with that terrifying, steamroller logic that characterized the Inquisition and in discussion makes twentieth-century blood run cold, the emotional appeal of the Church, and the recoil, are all there. Yet this is not merely a warning against “mixed” marriages; it is what it should be, a good story well told.

Another such is *THE MONKEY PUZZLE* by Betty de Sherbinin, though there is nothing ‘gaga’ about the headmistress whose life, private and teaching, among a British group in wartime Argentina, is as it were eavesdropped upon. The Buenos Aires families were glad to send their daughters to Paula's school, and, so real is the house, garden and atmosphere of the place, that the announcement on the back of the wrapper, of the author's 11 years in Buenos Aires where

she attended the English School, has been taken for granted long before the book's end. The dying husband, the former lover—a British Council lecturer forsooth—and the headmaster and his staff next door all serve their proper purpose in the scheme and even the physical appearance of Paula stamps itself firmly enough on the imagination to make her story memorable for that achievement alone.

Dr. Ommanney again

Another memorable book, which stamped itself on the imagination as long ago—astonishingly—as 14 years, was *South Latitude*; this prepared a warm welcome for its author's latest expedition among THE SHOALS OF CAPRICORN (*Longmans, Green*. 21s.) and, as with that so with this, it has been hard to put down, from its map of the islands of the western Indian Ocean to the last paragraph where:

The wide view of the sea was beginning to grow pale and the lights, shining through the mango trees, to grow wan before our last dawn in these islands. By the next sunrise . . . these two years . . . would have dwindled to a moment of time.

And yet the result was important enough. Between the Seychelles and Mauritius there are shallow waters, banks and coral strands which the Colonial Office saw as possible new fishing grounds. F. D. Ommanney and his friend John Wheeler set out in 1947 to investigate and their "mucking about in a drifter" established that there was enough food fish to make a commercial venture worth while. But there was much of excitement and interest in between, of calm and storm, of shipmates and creoles "black, lazy, improvident and cheerful," of lagoon and white beaches, of ports and jetties and, best of all, a combining of travel and natural history which makes for most of us the ideal adventure story.

The family of nations

There is a good deal of adventure too, unobtrusive and even unlikely as this may seem to be, between the covers of

such a mundane compilation of statistic as THE COMMONWEALTH RELATIONS OFFICE LIST 1952 (*H.M. Stationery Office*. 22s. 6d.). For it tells of those stirring "stages by which countries originally colonies or other dependencies of a mother country have become free and equal partners in a Commonwealth of Nations" and of the nature of their relationship to each other. The changes in the Commonwealth nationality laws are described and overseas settlement is historically surveyed. The List proper, of the names of Cabinet Ministers, Members of Parliament, heads of Government Departments, diplomatic representatives, with the existing parliamentary situation in each country, is tabulated. So too are United Kingdom parliamentary papers and Acts relating to the Commonwealth, and the organization of the Relations Office is set out in detail. It has been suggested that libraries and kindred bodies should find it useful; it is certain that editors of periodicals devoted to world topics would find its information indispensable. In fact, this identical copy is on loan—from THE FORTNIGHTLY editorial reference bookshelf.

Kingly burdens

From the Aucklands to Yukon territory, Commonwealth relations have been but strengthened, it would appear, by the snapping of its central link in death—"the magic link" of the Crown, as Mr. Winston Churchill called it in his broadcast tribute. With their customary despatch *Odhams* have produced THE LIFE AND TIMES OF KING GEORGE VI 1895-1952 (10s. 6d.), a full and readable picture-book of every phase of his 56 years' pilgrimage, more than ordinarily momentous even for a monarch. Having made their "farewell salute" the new Elizabethans all over the world should cherish such a memento of a good man, such a reminder of duty well done.

GRACE BANYARD

To Overseas Readers

If you wish to receive THE FORTNIGHTLY regularly and are living in one of the countries in the list below, you can place your subscription order with the agent named. Annual subscription to THE FORTNIGHTLY is £2. 2. 0 (six months £1. 1s.)

BELGIUM

Agence et Messageries de la Presse,
14-22, Rue du Persil,
Brussels.
The English Bookshop,
10, Boulevard Adolphe Max,
Brussels.

CEYLON

H. W. Cave & Co., Ltd.,
P.O. Box 25,
Colombo.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Messrs. Orbis Newsagents,
P.O. Box 240,
Praha 1.

DENMARK

Messrs. A. C. Illum,
Ostergade,
Copenhagen.

EGYPT

Messrs. N. & G. Chrissanthou,
25, Boulevard Saad Zaghloul,
Alexandria.

FINLAND

Messrs. Akateeminen Kirjakauppa,
Keskuskatu 2,
Helsingfors.

FRANCE

Librairie H. Le Soudier,
174, Boulevard St. Germain,
Paris.
Nouvelle Messageries de la Press Parisienne,
111, Rue Resumur,
Paris 2e.
Messrs. W. H. Smith & Son,
248, Rue de Rivoli,
Paris.

GERMANY

Fa. Ausland-Zeitungsverlag,
W. E. Saabach,
Frankenstrasse 14,
Köln-Junkersdorf.

GREECE

Librairie Kauffmann,
28, Rue Winston Churchill
Athens.

HOLLAND

Messrs. Van Gelderen & Zoon,
N.Z. Voorburgwal 230-232,
Amsterdam C.

HUNGARY

Messrs. Ibusz,
Akademia u. 10,
Budapest.

INDIA

Messrs. Newman & Co.,
3, Old Court House Street,
Calcutta.
The Oxford Book & Stationery Co.,
Park Street,
Calcutta.
Messrs. Varadachary & Co.,
8, Lingha Chetty Street,
Madras.

ITALY

Libreria Internazionale,
Ulrico Hoepli,
Galleria Piazza Colonna,
Roma.

KENYA

Messrs. S. J. Moore,
Government Road,
Nairobi.

NORWAY

Messrs. Narvesens,
Kioskkompani,
Box 125,
Oslo.

PORTUGAL

Livraria Bertrand,
73, Rue Garrett. 75,
Lisbonne.

SOUTH AMERICA

Acme Agency,
Casilla de Correo 1136,
Buenos Aires.
Messrs. Cass Crashley Ltd.,
58, Ouvidor,
Caixa Postal 906,
Rio de Janeiro.

SPAIN

Sociedad General Espanola de Libreria,
Evaristo San Miguel 9,
Madrid.
Sociedad General Espanola de Libreria,
Barbara 14 y 61 bis,
Barcelona.

SUDAN

The Sudan Bookshop,
P.O. Box 156,
Khartoum.

SWEDEN

Messrs. Wennergren-Williams, A.B.,
Drottninggatan 71 D,
Stockholm.

TURKEY

Librairie Hachette,
469, Avenue de Pindependance, 469,
Istanbul.

U.S.A. and Canada

Rate : Annual subscription \$6.50 (U.S.), \$7.00 (Canadian)

Brentano's Inc., 586, Fifth Avenue, N.Y. City, New York.
Crowley, Inc., 511-513, E. 164th Street, New York 56, New York.
Wm. Dawson Subscription Service, Ltd., 60, Front Street, West, Toronto 1, Canada.
The F. W. Faxon Co., Faxon Buildings, 83-91, Francis Street, Back Bay, Boston 15 Mass.
Herman Goldberger Agency, Inc., 147, Essex Street, Boston 11, Mass.
Hanson-Bennett Magazine Agency, 529, S. Franklin Street, Chicago, 7 Illinois.
International News Co., 131, Varick Street New York, 13 New York.
Moore-Cottrell Subscription Agencies, Inc., North Cohocton, New York.
Mutual Subscription Agency, 1420, Chestnut Street, Philadelphia 2, Pa.
National Publications Co., 1106, S. Broadway, Los Angeles 15, California.
Smith & McCance, 5, Ashburton Place, Boston, Mass.

JUN 30 1952

TOWARDS AN ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY?

You should read

- (1) because it is important
- (2) because it makes fascinating reading

The Conference of Strasbourg

between delegations of Congress of the United States
of America and of the Consultative Assembly of the
Council of Europe.

5/-

\$1.50

For this and all other publications of the Council of Europe apply to:

THE HANSARD SOCIETY,
39 MILLBANK
LONDON
S.W.1.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS
2960 BROADWAY
NEW YORK 27
N.Y., U.S.A.

Catalogue on request.